DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 077 390 HE 004 194

AUTHOR	Baum, Martha
TITLE	Inter-Group Cooperation and Urban Problem-Solving: Observation on a Community Long-Range Goals Project.
INSTITUTION	Pittsburgh Univ., Pa. University Urban Interface Program.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Div. of Higher Education Research.
BUREAU NO	BR-8-0725
PUB DATE	May 73
CONTRACT	OEG-2-9-480725-1027
NOTE	99p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Community Relations; *Educational Innovation; *Higher Education; *Intergroup Relations; Program Descriptions; Research Projects; *School Community Relationship
IDENTIFIERS	*Community Long Range Goals Project

ABSTRACT

This document reviews the University of Pittsburgh Community Long-Range Goals project carried out in 1970-72. Emphasis is placed on introductory material and developmental history, immediate preceding events in the University, perspectives on the process, participation at the forums, notes of participant cbservers, questionnaire follow-up for goal forums and conclusions. Related documents are HE 004 198 and HE 004 195. (MJM)

ED 077390

INTER-GROUP COOPERATION AND URBAN PROBLEM-SOLVING

Observation on a Community Long-Range Goals Project

UNIVERSITY-URBAN INTERFACE PROGRAM

CONTRACT NO. OEG-2-9-180725-(027)

PROJECT NO. 8-0725

SUBMITTED TO THE

BUREAU OF RESEARCH U.S.O.E.

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH

SCOPE OF INTEREST NOTICE

The ERIC Facility has assigned this document for processing to: HE SO

In our judgement, this document is also of interest to the clearinghouses noted to the right. Indexing should reflect their special points of view.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

ED 077390

INTER-GROUP COOPERATION AND URBAN PROBLEM-SOLVING

Observation on a Community Long-Range Goals Project

By

Martha Baum

May, 1973

This paper was prepared under the auspices of the University-Urban Interface Program; Principal Investigator, Albert C. Van Dusen, Secretary of the University; Director, Robert C. Brictson. The Buhl Foundation also contributed support to the project.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Introduction and Developmental History	1
The Contemporary Urban Scene	2
The Local Scene: Precedents for Inter-Organizational Cooperation	4
Immediate Preceding Events in the University	8
Attempts to Mobilize for Change	8
The University-Urban Interface Program	10
Perspectives on the Process	12
Research Interests and Techniques	12
Project Goals and Implementation: The Early Phase of the Goals Project	14
Doctrine	16
Themes	17
Leadership	19
Personnel	21
Resources	23
Organization	25
Linkages	27
Participation at the Forums: Invitations and Attendance	28
At the Forums: From the Notes of Participant Observers	36
In the Lecture Room	38
The Discussion Groups	39
Luncheon, Dinner, and the Social Hour	42
Feedback Sessions	43
Plenary Sessions	45

Page

Major Themes in the Observers' Reports 45

The Social Climate at the Forums 47

Perspectives on the University 60

Questionnaire Follow-Up for Goals Forums 66

Frequency Distributions 67

Cross-Tabulations 70

Content Analysis 73

Summary of Findings 83

Conclusions 85

Bibliography 94

INTER-GROUP COOPERATION AND URBAN PROBLEM-SOLVING

Observation on a Community Long-Range Goals Project

Introduction and Developmental History

Urban universities in the United States have been under increasing pressure to find solutions for the problems in the cities that surround them. Many universities feel they can and should contribute but will not be able to accomplish very much without the help of other sectors of the community. In 1968, Nathan Pusey, then president of Harvard University, made a statement to this effect:

> It may be worth remarking that, however large is Harvard's influence and potential for good or bad in Cambridge and Boston, the University is not alone in its effect and cannot proceed alone. What is required is a community-wide reassessment by all the Cambridge and Boston educational institutions, the financial and industrial enterprises and the city governments, cooperating with men and women of good will from the general public to determine the appropriate goals and then work to effect the environmental changes which all of us know are needed. (Wilson, et. al., 1968:iv)

At the University of Pittsburgh, a project on Community Long Range Goals was carried out in the years 1970-72 which provided opportunities to explore on two levels the feasibility of inter-group cooperation in solving urban problems. On the first, or "action" level, individuals representing various segments of the Pittsburgh community were identified and then brought together to discuss problem priorities and possible solutions. At the second, or "research" level, it was also possible to monitor the project and collect additional data on the process. This report is derived from the research perspective and provides complementary information to reports issued by project directors who carried out the activities.

Both the project and research on the project were made possible by a grant from the United States Office of Education. Before looking at the specific project, a brief discussion of the circumstances in which the Goals Project came into being may be useful.

The Contemporary Urban Scene: The great federal programs which were launched in the recent past to cure America's urban ills are now being partially withdrawn. During the late 1960's, trust in solutions "from the top" appears largely to have evaporated. In spite of all the resources expended, things did not seem to be getting any better. Not only were the old problems still unsolved, but new ones were emerging. The sweeping programs which were planned were impeded for a number of reasons, among them the opposition of a host of vested interests and the growth of new claims to the right to participate in decision-making at the grassroots level. In the present political climate, the burden for problem-solving seems to be shifting toward local communities and local organizations.

Progress at the local level would also require a great deal of cooperation among many different groups. The many studies of community conflict illustrate the likely difficulties ahead. (Truman, 1951; Key, 1958; Dahl, 1961; Hunter, 1963; Gamson, 1968) In these studies, it was generally found that, far from cooperating with one another, local groups competed ardently, as each group sought to ensure advantages for itself. Furthermore, in terms of seeking solutions to pressing urban problems, the urban scene is already a crowded one. Any agency or institution offering a solution for some problem is likely to find other groups on the scene already working in the same area or related areas. To quote a recent report from Harvard University:

> In every area (in the community) to which this committee has turned its attention, there are already programs underway, organizations formed, spokesmen selected, conflicts apparent. (Wilson, et. al., 1968:13)

Each group has a tendency to stake out its own "territory" and try to exclude other units even when the same concerns are shared.*

The explanation for this lack of cooperation cannot be found in competition for scarce resources alone. Different kinds of interests are very likely to develop among the specialized institutions which are found in urban industrial societies. In these milieux, organizations are created especially to handle particular social needs--economic, political, educational, religious, and so on. (Parsons and Smelser, 1956) Organizations of this type are held to be more efficient because they can concentrate on a narrow range of goals and not disperse the available talent, energies, and resources over many areas. But there may also be socially disruptive results. More specialized values may build up around a particular sphere of activity. At some point, even with good will on all sides, it becomes then very difficult to gain any agreement among the different social units as to what is most beneficial for the society as a whole. For example, at the moment, environmental specialists and corporation executives cannot agree on whether it is more in the general social interest to have "clean air" or "a high standard of living". Both sides evidently agree that both goals cannot be pursued simultaneously with equal vigor, and so the controversy goes on.

---

*For an interesting description of what can happen when a new agency attempts to intervene where there are already a number of agencies working on the same problem, see: Walter B. Miller, Rainer C. Baum, and Rosetta McNeil, "Delinquency Prevention and Organizational Relations," in Stanton Wheeler (ed.), Controlling Delinquents, New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1968.

Cross-pressures of this kind, at whatever level they are found, lead to a sense of stalemate and lack of progress. However, there seem to be indications of a new interest in making contributions to the public welfare on the part of various organizations, even though there may not be much agreement on how to go about it. The public statements of university administrators, corporation executives, church officials, and other spokesmen for major institutions indicate agreement that the quality of the general environment must be considered along with more specific goals. Advertising in the public media as well, coming from many different types of agencies, organizations and groups, contains more and more messages about social responsibility. There is far more emphasis on the service aspect of what an organization is doing.

The Community Long-Range Goals Project was carried out, then, in a national climate composed of a large measure of frustration combined with some new elements of public-spiritedness.

The Local Scene: Precedents for Inter-Organizational Cooperation: In a number of American cities, there have been at least sporadic joint efforts to bring representatives of the private and public sectors together to remedy some perceived environmental deficiency. In the United States, government has never been accorded sufficient power to accomplish major reconstruction by itself. Pittsburgh, center for coal and steel and concomitant labor and housing problems, has been the scene of a long series of such joint efforts, beginning at the turn of the century.* At that time, a small elite of business and professional men

---

*The ensuing description of developments in Pittsburgh during this century has been taken from Roy Lubove, Twentieth Century Pittsburgh: Government, Business, and Environmental Change, New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1969.

combined in an effort to "rationalize" the local government and to improve housing and health conditions for the city's workers. The working classes in Pittsburgh were evidently too fragmented ethnically and, due to the peculiarities of the physical landscape, geographically, to engage in organized action on their own behalf. It appeared, then, that improvement in the notably poor housing conditions in the area would have to be brought about from the top. The elite were wary of vesting very much real power in government because they highly valued individual autonomy. Reform, therefore, was to be accomplished mainly through tax incentives and regulations for health and sanitation. Without governmental powers of enforcement, these measures proved to be inadequate, at least in part because of a split within the elite between those who were locally based and those who were nationally based. The former were themselves too much involved in housing and land speculations to accept more than the most superficial regulation. Efforts of a similar kind were recurrent throughout the first part of this century, yet they always stemmed from the same sources, employed similar methods, and brought forth the same general results. Only during the years following World War II was there real impact on the local scene from a joint effort for environmental improvement.

Immediately preceding and also during the period of the war, plans were developed for flood and smoke control. The plans, however, largely relied on voluntary cooperation which proved to be insufficient. The environmental crisis continued to escalate, culminating in a recognition that voluntary efforts were insufficient given the magnitude of the problems. Throughout the war years, production and employment in Pittsburgh were at a peak, but the area continued to deteriorate. By the end of the war, it became almost impossible to recruit new industry and additional

labor. Even more crucially, some of the major national corporations in Pittsburgh were considering withdrawing from the area. It began to become apparent that if the city could not be rebuilt, it would be abandoned.

The Allegheny Conference on Community Development (ACCD) was formed by a corporate elite in 1943. This body utilized professional expertise in planning and worked toward including all relevant agencies in a consensual approach for the implementation of plans. Perhaps more importantly, the cooperation of government at all levels was enlisted. Regulatory barriers could thus be set aside and massive resources in land and money were made available. The first step was to begin revitalizing the downtown business area through clearing out deteriorated buildings, establishing a public park, and constructing bridges and highways to facilitate access. Effective action on smoke control and flood control followed in remarkably rapid succession, given the obstacles which had been encountered in the past. During the period 1945-50, a rather thorough reconstruction of the downtown area was accomplished. The entire enterprise was labeled the "Pittsburgh Renaissance".

The success of ACCD was mainly in the areas of corporate development and in smoke and flood control. However, there were also attempts at "cultural" improvements which largely failed. Conference leaders felt that professionals could be lured to Pittsburgh partly through cultivating the arts in the city, but efforts in this direction were apparently misguided or too marginal to have any significant impact. Similarly, although there were many new buildings, many complained of too little attention to architectural taste and continuity in their construction. The river banks, high in scenic potential, were also left in a cluttered, bedraggled state. Perhaps the most important failure, however, was in housing. Housing improvement

had had top priority among civic groups since the turn of the century, yet middle and lower income housing actually deteriorated during the time the ACCD was effecting the "Renaissance".

During the 1960's, protest against further activities on the part of the Conference developed in connection with poverty and civil rights issues. Protest consolidated around slum housing and neighborhood power. The Conference came to be viewed as a "reverse welfare state", dominated by corporate and political managers and serving primarily their interests without regard for the needs of the average citizen. In the late 1960's ACCD responded by agreeing to revise its priorities and to incorporate certain citizens' groups in its planning structure. It is not yet clear whether the expanded organization will be accepted as a major vehicle for social change in the future or, indeed, whether the variety of groups now included will be able to work together with any degree of harmony.

There are, then, precedents for successful cooperative action in solving urban problems in Pittsburgh. At the end of the sixties, however, the most successful agent had become quiescent due to community criticism of some of its ventures.

It might be added that the several universities in Pittsburgh were only somewhat peripherally involved in the improvement efforts, although university experts were sometimes asked to be consultants in certain areas. The University of Pittsburgh did become associated with a sub-group, called ACTION-Housing, formed by ACCD to work on urban problems at the neighborhood level. Following some initial attempts at developing programs for community-based attacks on local needs in terms of physical and social change, a plan evolved to establish an urban extension of the University. An Urban Extension Conference was held in 1961, and in 1963 a

grant was received from the Ford Foundation for a five-year demonstration project concentrating on three disadvantaged areas. During the demonstration phase, there were some modest accomplishments in terms of the development of indigenous community leadership and physical improvements of the neighborhoods. On the whole, however, inputs from the University were felt to be disappointing. The role of the University had not been well defined from the outset, and participation on the part of University representatives was largely informal and even nominal. There was no firm commitment on the part of the University to encourage full participation. Furthermore, the role developed for University representatives was that of "urban generalist." This amorphous title carried a definition which called for enormously diversified qualifications in both expertise and personal leadership. Those from the University who did participate were expected to be able to enter the designated neighborhoods and work in cooperation with the indigenous citizens on a wide variety of problems. The expectations seem to have been unrealistically high. Conflict soon arose between experts who wanted careful professional planning and citizens who were impatient to see something actually get done about their perceived needs.

As conceived and implemented at that time, then, the Urban Extension did not become a viable method of involving the University of Pittsburgh in the community. As discussed in the next section, however, during the sixties, and to some extent, even in the fifties, the University was engaging in some planning of its own in terms of relations with the surrounding community.

Immediate Preceding Events in the University

Attempts to Mobilize for Change: Like all universities in urban areas in the United States today, the University of Pittsburgh has been subjected to pressures from various sources to become involved in urban

problems. The federal government, from which the University of Pittsburgh receives major funding for research and other activities, has through its agencies been a strong and insistent force in this direction. When the University of Pittsburgh became state-related in 1967, pressures were increased. The reactions of the administration and other constituencies have been detailed elsewhere.* For the purposes of this report, a concise quotation will suffice to outline the developments:

> The interaction between major metropolitan universities and their urban communities has become a matter of national concern. The intensity of our urban problems and the growing public awareness of them have made these problems a top domestic priority. At the same time, universities--once perceived as cloisters for ineffectual academics--have come to be viewed as a powerful resource for the practical solution of all sorts of national problems, especially those peculiar to the urban environment.
>
> The University of Pittsburgh, located in the heart of an urban community with the whole spectrum of urban ills--ghettos, unemployment, air pollution, traffic congestion--has long been "officially" committed to helping find solutions to these problems. As early as 1952, in a report to the Middle States Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, the University enumerated a number of courses and programs designed specifically to meet urban needs. By 1956, the University was advocating new directions and a more active role, and beginning to regard itself as a vehicle for doing things that would not otherwise be done.

---

*See, for example, Proposal for Continuation of a University-Urban Interface Program, Office of the Vice Chancellor for Program Development and Public Affairs, University of Pittsburgh, December, 1969; The Response of an Urban University to Change, Overview, Volume I, A Report to the Commission on Institutions of Higher Education of the Middle States Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, University of Pittsburgh, March, 1971.

> Immediately following his appointment in 1967, Chancellor Wesley W. Posvar requested an inventory of existing University programs relating to urban development, and in subsequent statements, policy directives, and budget commitments he has given substance to the University's pledge to better the welfare of the urban community in general and, in particular, to advance the cause of social justice.
>
> Early in the effort, a University Council on Urban Programs (UCUP) was established under the chairmanship of the Vice Chancellor for Program Development and Public Affairs. With University-wide interest and enthusiasm thus aroused, the Chancellor requested faculty to examine how they could better help meet critical urban problems and to propose new programs. In response, over 100 detailed proposals requiring new funding were submitted. The Offices of the Provost, the Vice Chancellor for Program Development and Public Affairs, and the Director of Planning evaluated the proposals and prepared a list of the ones they felt merited funding. Presentations were made to potential donors, and funds were secured which enabled some divisions of the University to move beyond volunteer efforts. Others were able to undertake really substantial programs.
>
> Despite these accomplishments, by early 1969 the University was still seeking ways to make its commitment more explicit, to determine what role the University should plan in the community, and to mobilize its resources to perform that role. (UUIP Brochure, 1972)

The University-Urban Interface Program: In 1969 the University Council on Urban Programs recommended the submission of a proposal to the U. S. Office of Education which had evinced an interest in research on the response of urban universities to community needs. The Council and other members of the University cooperated on a proposal which was ultimately funded by the Office of Education under the title, University-Urban Interface Program.* In the interim before the grant was awarded, a private

---

*Contract No. OEG 29-48072-1027, Project No. 80725.

foundation provided funds which allowed the University to begin recruiting personnel and implementing some of the ideas put forward in the proposal.*

The University of Pittsburgh is a very large and complex institution, containing many departments and professional schools, as well as tens of thousands of students. One of the major tasks for the authors of the Program proposal was to select, out of numerous possibilities, several vital areas for intensive scrutiny. The grant explicitly stated that funds must be spent on the study of efforts by the University of Pittsburgh and could not be used to implement action projects. Accordingly, project investigators had to choose among ongoing activities. An exception was the Long-Range Goals Project, which was regarded in large part as a piece of research in itself, supplying information on community priorities and needs, as well as a test of the feasibility of cooperative interaction among diverse community groups. The proposal finally focused on four priority areas for detailed study:

1. Minority and Community Services
2. Campus Development
3. Communications
4. Long-Range Pittsburgh Goals

During the final year of the grant, information gathered on the four priorities would be analyzed and synthesized in an attempt to provide organized inputs into a fifth priority, University Governance for Community Relations. The overall goal of the University-Urban Interface Program is to provide insights into the management of community-University relations which will be useful in decision-making and policy formation, both at the University of Pittsburgh and elsewhere.

---

*The Buhl Foundation.

Perspectives on the Process

Research Interests and Techniques: The Goals Project was organized in a social and political climate which seemed to call for more action at the community level and also for more cooperation between organizations and groups. Goals Project organizers hoped to initiate and establish the means upon which cooperative action could be undertaken using the University as the source for the mobilization of interests. To this end, they began a series of activities designed to form a basis for future continuous action on urban problems. How the project was organized and implemented is described in some detail in the next section.

The research aims in connection with the Goals Project were of a somewhat different, although complementary, nature. Those who were carrying out the project were involved in working out the general format and then the details for implementation, in marshalling resources, and in organizing the many parts which had to be pulled together. They had to resolve problems, make choices, and pay attention to many small but necessary details. Relieved of these constraints, those in the research office of the University-Urban Interface Program planned ways of gathering additional information from a more detached perspective. Research on the project focused primarily on three questions:

(1) What is involved in setting up such a project and on what basis are choices among alternatives made in the process of goal attainment?

(2) How is the project received both in terms of amount and quality of participation and also in terms of perceptions of utility on the part of participants?

(3) What is the feasibility of such an enterprise given the contemporary social climate: What can be learned from the experience for the future of this or any similar approach to cooperative social action?

The necessary information was gained with the full cooperation of the Goals Project organizers. Besides access to proposals, progress reports, minutes of meetings, recorders' notes, papers written for the project, data from a project-conducted survey, memoranda, and letters on project matters, researchers collected additional data by attendance at project meetings, interviews with those implementing the project, participant observation, and a questionnaire constructed in the research office. The director of the project and the chief research assistant have produced their own report (Gow and Salmon-Cox, 1972), which includes a descriptive analysis of the main operations of the project, four Goals Forums, along with other pertinent materials. The materials for that report were drawn from some of the same sources mentioned above. In this paper, an attempt is made to avoid duplication of that report which constitutes an excellent overview and also offers some after-thoughts, although it will be drawn upon occasionally for additional information or insights. This report will concentrate chiefly on material which is either not included there or which is treated in a different manner. As the different sections of this report are presented, the pertinent sources of information will be identified. The following sections cover the initial planning and implementation of the project, the reports of the participant observers at the four Forums, data on attendance at the Forums, content analysis of the social climate at the Forums, perspectives on the University from several sources, results from a follow-up questionnaire on the Forums, and a final summary of the

endeavor with some considerations of possible alternatives to problems encountered and some thoughts about the future.

Project Goals and Implementation: The Early Phase of the Goals Project: To present material on the early phases of planning and setting in motion the Goals Project, an organizing device is used to ensure coverage of the more important considerations involved. This device has been very helpful to the University-Urban Interface Program as a whole. Since the proposal identified four rather different areas of University-Community relations for intensive study, the need for some kind of integrating framework applicable to all four areas was recognized early in the research process. It was especially important because the eventual program goal was to bring information from the several areas together in the last phase of the program for a unified perspective on University policy-making in the domain of community relations. The Institution-Building model was adopted as the framework for data collection and analysis for all program study priorities. (Nehnevajsa, 1964; Esman and Blaise, 1966; Esman, 1967; Nehnevajsa, 1967) Parts of this model provide a useful way of discussing the early phase of the Goals Project. The model points to six internal variables which have to be taken into account in the building of any institution, organization, agency, or, in this case, project. The model also describes four types of external relations, termed "linkages", which supply necessary inputs or receive outputs from the unit under study. A time perspective is incorporated to direct attention to alterations in the building process in the course of development. In the descriptive material which follows, particular attention is paid to the six internal variables: doctrine (goals), themes (programs), leadership, personnel, resources, and organization. Some attention is also paid to certain vital

linkages. The time perspective will be incorporated into the discussion of the internal variables insofar as changes of any import occurred, but in this preliminary description only very early changes are included. The discussion moves only to that point where the major activity of the project, the Goals Forums, is actually underway. Later in the report, the Institution-Building model will be drawn upon in a somewhat different interpretation in connection with the social climate at the Forums. However, a final assessment of what occurred over time and the relationship of events to the status of the project at the termination of the research will be reserved for the summary section.

The Community Long-Range Goals Project became an integral and rather special part of the University-Urban Interface Program during the process of planning and proposal writing during 1969. The representatives of the University involved in this process felt that establishing better relations with the community would require a long range and comprehensive approach to cooperative action on urban problems. At this point, they felt that the universities of the nation--and other institutions as well--were equipped only to react in a crisis or ad hoc basis to the many calls for assistance in urban areas. There was a fundamental lack of information about the needs and desires of the many groups identifiable and emerging on the urban scene. Although there were many programs in the University of Pittsburgh oriented to particular groups and their expressed needs, there seemed to be no mechanism operative which would make it possible to work simultaneously with various segments of the community in a context which allowed for continuous structured interaction. The Goals Project was the outcome of this concern, and unlike the other three areas to be studied, required the development of a new project, rather than the

monitoring of projects already begun from sources outside UUIP. The early history of the Goals Project is traced below in the Institution-Building framework, making use of the six internally-oriented variables with some reference to linkages. No attempt is made to cover in minute detail the entire process. Rather, the emphasis is on highlighting the complexity of putting a project of this sort together and the choices which were made along the way. Sources used for the account of the early history included proposals, progress reports, interviews with the project director and the research assistant, minutes of meetings, observation at meetings, and memoranda.

Doctrine: In connection with this variable, the unit under study is looked at in terms of the goals which have been set and the justification for these goals. Project justification in the proposal was organized around the belief that universities and other key institutions were handicapped in providing community service by a lack of knowledge of community long-range goals. On this basis, goals for the project were articulated as developing "the means for getting regular and reliable readings of the urban community's goals and for continually mediating between emerging goals and the policy-making processes of universities and other key institutions of the community." (Gow and Salmon-Cox, 1972:2) It would be essential that the "readings" involve all segments of the community to achieve truly representative goals. Ultimately, a model for institutionalizing or making permanent this information-gathering and policy-influencing process would be developed which could be used not only by the University of Pittsburgh and its community, but also by other urban universities and their communities. In the case of the University of Pittsburgh, it was hoped that a stable institutionalized system could be developed by the end

of the planned four-year University-Urban Interface Program. In sum, the project aimed at establishing an ongoing system for collecting, processing, and translating into policy recommendations, the goals of the various segments of the Pittsburgh community. The concept "long-range goals" is a cue to an emphasis on goal-setting as a slow and changing phenomenon. Thus, project goals at this level were oriented far into the future, and the initial phase of the project could be conceived of as only a step in this direction.

Themes: The term "themes" can be translated into programs, or the mechanisms by which goals are to be implemented. Initially, in the long-range perspective, two mechanisms were identified. There would be a community assembly, convened every two or three years, in which participants representing all segments of the community would be brought together to identify new or emerging goals and bring them into some sort of priority ordering with more established long-range goals. Eventually, an organization, tentatively called a Community Policy Research Institute, would be established which would supply information to the assemblies and also use the developments in the assemblies to make policy recommendations. These two mechanisms, in coordination, would provide the basis for structured, permanent University-Community interaction.

Before these major programs could be put in effect, however, the project had to work out a more modest beginning. For the purpose of reasonably early implementation, it was decided to prepare for one community assembly augmented by several background papers on pressing community problems. During 1970, the project director and the project Steering Committee (to be described later) met frequently to work on the design of the assembly and the formulation of topics for the background

papers. As they met, the concept of "community goals" came to be respecified. It was agreed that goals in the project context referred more to aspirations in the community than to anything resembling formal policy. The distinctive character of the project would be to try and detect and anticipate goals that community groups, particularly those with little access to the influential councils of the community, were beginning to espouse and to attempt to align them with more established goals. The original assembly had been conceived of more as one in which representatives of all segments of the community would be brought together to hear papers by experts on current issues and to provide feedback. Discourse on the special aims of the project, however, led to a concern that those in the community who had not in the past had a chance to air their views would also be lost in the one big assembly context. It came to seem more appropriate to the planners to move toward a series of smaller assemblies where those who attended could be involved directly in discussion rather than, essentially, constituting an audience. A concomitant result of the decision to have several assemblies was the notion of appealing to those vitally interested in a particular subject matter in order to ensure participation by community groups. On this basis, several assemblies (in the new format relabeled Forums after a time) were eventually planned, each to be organized around a specific topic. By March 1, 1971, it had been agreed that four assemblies would be held, about one month apart, in the Fall of 1971. Specific topics had been agreed upon, and two papers were already in outline form. Some tentative guidelines had been formed for conducting the Forums which were to be all-day affairs held at a hotel near the University of Pittsburgh campus.

It can be seen that in the process of setting the project in motion, one key mechanism was considerably altered. The assembly, originally conceived of as including all segments of the community in a fairly comprehensive discussion on community problems, has been transformed into several smaller, more discussion-oriented sessions on specific issues. Although there are obvious advantages in this decision, it also seems apparent that the kind of broad-ranged and broad-based discussion and reaction originally planned could not be attained in this newer format. Using the Forum model seemed to imply a more exploratory approach than had been considered under the original plan for one community-wide assembly.

With respect to the "policy center", there was some discussion of using this as one of the Forum topics. For several reasons, this was not done, although a draft proposal was written incorporating some of the ideas. (Holzner, 1971) An interest in such a mechanism was maintained throughout the project, but it was never an explicit topic offered for discussion in the Forums. The director of the project felt that it might be inappropriate to promote the idea of a policy center until he had received input from community groups at the Forums, since they might well have their own ideas on how to institutionalize community-university interaction.

Leadership: Funding available permitted compensated part-time for one faculty member, salary for one research assistant, and expenditures for background papers and the Forums. It was apparent from the outset that a good deal of voluntary help would be needed to accomplish the goals of the project. Dr. Steele Gow, Dean of the Division of Instructional Experimentation at the University of Pittsburgh, accepted the position of director. Dr. Gow had been a student at the University and

had subsequently held several very responsible posts on the faculty and in the administration. He was also very active in local and state affairs in connection with education, social welfare, and government, and thus well-known in the community. For all these reasons, he was in an excellent position to mobilize both internal and external support for the activities of the project. This capacity seems to be central to the success of any project of this kind. Dr. Gow had been a member of the University Council on Urban Programs, referred to earlier, which was instrumental in submitting a proposal to the Office of Education. Not only was he closely involved in the planning for the University-Urban Interface Program, but he was mainly responsible for organizing and editing the final draft of the proposal. Dr. Gow was able to work out the final design for the Goals Project and elicit the cooperation he needed from many sources in order to carry the project through the completion of the four Goals Forums which were eventually decided upon.

Midway in the project, Dr. Gow accepted a position as Dean of General Studies at the University of Pittsburgh, which meant that he had less time for the project. By this time, however, most of the planning had been done, and the plans were being put into action. Nevertheless, it would have been difficult to see the project through to completion if the director had not always worked very closely with the project research assistant, Mrs. Leslie Salmon-Cox, who had been involved in the entire development after the very initial phase. She was fully capable of absorbing many of the ongoing project responsibilities, and she became the primary coordinator for the stage immediately preceding the Forums. In her hands, also, were the final arrangements for the Forums. It was most helpful for project goals that the director and the research assistant not

only worked well together, but also that each possessed the skills and the patience necessary to bring all the parts together. It should be mentioned, however, that there were times when the energies of the two figures mainly responsible for the Goals Project were severely strained. Project leadership was of the best, but the responsibilities allocated to these two persons were very heavy given the resources available to the project.

Personnel: Under the heading of personnel, attention should go mainly to those who played auxiliary roles in planning and operationalizing the project. First and foremost was the Steering Committee, composed of 15 members (including Dr. Gow and Mrs. Salmon-Cox), recruited with one exception from the University of Pittsburgh.* Originally, it had been planned that members of the Steering Committee would be compensated for time spent on the project, but eventually they served voluntarily and compensation was made available for the authors of papers. The Steering Committee, judging from minutes and observer reports from the meetings, worked regularly and with commitment from early in 1970 on. In this committee, project goals were discussed and the design for the Forums was evolved. They helped to decide on Forum topics, and some members were engaged to write papers. They also helped along with Advisory Committees to be discussed later, to identify public and private groups to be invited to the Forums by locating the various segments of the community to be included and supplying names through personal acquaintance and, where necessary, from public documents. From these rosters, they also were able to aid in defining the sample for the Pittsburgh Goals Survey (see under Resources) which was carried out in connection with the project.

---

*The exception was Dr. Matthew Holden, of the University of Wisconsin, who was recruited to the Committee in the Spring of 1971 when he agreed to write a paper on the Administration of Justice for one of the Forums.

As each Forum topic was decided upon, the Steering Committee undertook the appointment of an Advisory Committee for that Forum. Criteria for these committees were that members should be involved in the special topic of a particular Forum, that each Forum should have its own committee and that no individual should be a member of more than one Advisory Committee, that membership of any given Committee should be composed of about half university and half community representatives, and that blacks and young persons should be well represented on each committee. On the whole, these criteria were met. The one exception was with young persons. Individuals under thirty were only very marginally represented in the Forums themselves and none were on Advisory Committees. The responsibilities of Advisory Committees included selecting from and adding to the lists of possible participants for each Forum, with a view of gaining as wide a representation as possible within a particular field of interest. For example, the Forum on the Administration of Justice was to involve (and did) as community representatives lawyers, judges, beat policemen, bondsmen, public officials, representatives of civil rights groups, and others interested in this area. Advisory Committee members were also expected to read and comment on background papers and help out at the Forums in the capacity of leaders for discussion groups or, more informally, to keep things going if the "dialogue" became stalled.

It can be seen that implementing the Goals Project depended heavily on the voluntary participation of a large number of persons. Each Advisory Committee contained between eight and twelve persons. Aside from the director and the research assistant, it required 64 persons to man the Steering and Advisory Committees. On the whole, "voluntarism" seems to have worked. Most of the Committee members really did make contributions,

and this system provided a broader base of knowledge of the community and its population than could have been realized with a small cadre of paid personnel. However, it would be hard to imagine exacting this level of cooperation without the experience and familiarity with the situation brought to this project by its director.

Resources: The economic base for the Goals Project was supplied mainly by the Office of Education, with some supplementary help from the Buhl Foundation and the University of Pittsburgh. The Office of Education grant will be discussed further under Linkages because of its external nature. It may be mentioned here that support for the project was adequate to cover only the more exploratory phase of the project. There was no commitment by the University to proceed to the long-range goals which were discussed under Doctrine.

One major resource available to the project was the expertise of colleagues. It has already been noted that the University supplied most of the manpower needed to staff committees. It was also the source which was drawn upon to supply background papers. Although it was necessary to drop two topics because no paper author could be found, three papers were eventually commissioned. Two papers were collaborative efforts whose senior authors were also members of the Steering Committee (Coleman, et. al., 1971; Treuting, et. al., 1971). The third paper was prepared by a professor at the University of Wisconsin, who had formerly been at the University of Pittsburgh, and was well acquainted with the local scene (Holden, 1971). The director himself undertook to write a paper for the fourth Forum, since the topic was a special concern of his (Gow, 1972). Another resource provided in the University of Pittsburgh was the Research Advisory Council for the University-Urban Interface Program. This council,

recruited among members of the University, was to aid in designing the program's research and evaluating the activities conducted by the program. One of the members of the council agreed to conduct a survey of local "influentials" on goals for the Pittsburgh area. The survey has been written up in detail elsewhere,* and a brief summary of the design will suffice here:

> One paper, which presumably will be used for the first assembly in the series, will have as its aim to clarify the ways various elements of the Pittsburgh metropolitan community see the future of that community and to identify the perception each such element has of the goals of the other elements. A qualitative questionnaire is being developed which will seek to ascertain:
>
> (a) what the respondent thinks ought to be done;
> (b) what he thinks ought not to be done;
> (c) what he expects to happen in the course of the next ten years;
> (d) which groups and organizations he thinks share his view as to what should be done;
> (e) which groups or organizations he thinks hold views incompatible with his; and
> (f) what he thinks the University and other community institutions should do.
>
> Persons receiving the questionnaire will be what some sociologists call "influentials"--that is, individuals in positions of authority or leadership in such organizations as city government, educational institutions, health and welfare agencies, labor unions, management organizations, ethnic organizations, and the like. Open-ended probes will follow the use of structured items. (University-Urban Interface Program, Supplementary Information, March-September, 1970)

As the text quoted above indicates, the survey was originally intended to be used as a topic for one of the Forums. After some consideration,

---

*The results of the survey are now incorporated in a report: Jiri Nehnevajsa, in collaboration with Alan Coleman, Pittsburgh: Goals and Futures, University of Pittsburgh: University-Urban Interface Program, January, 1973.

however, it was decided instead to draw upon the survey for general background information for all of the Forums. Pre-testing for the survey began late in 1970, and the data was collected, analyzed, and organized for four brief presentations by the time the Forums were in process. The University-base of the project made it easier for the director to find the people he needed who could execute a survey and supply basic information to Forum participants through the background papers.

Organization: The organization of the project was almost entirely in the hands of the director and the research assistant. Organization required moving from the planning phase to the paper-writing and survey phase to the invitation-issuing phase to the arrangements for the Forums, while simultaneously keeping track of a large number of moving parts. In the early planning phase, the decision was made to move toward more informal, depth discussion Forums for which background information would be supplied to participants. Arrangements were made soon after for the survey and two of the background papers. However, it was not until the late Spring of 1971 that authors had been found for four papers, and tentative dates could be set forth for the Forums. The Steering Committee agreed that four Forums were the maximum feasible under the time and money constraints of the project. The Forums would be held, about a month apart, in the Fall and Winter of 1971-1972. During the late Spring and Summer of 1971, arrangements for the Forums had to be completed. There must be Advisory Committees, completed papers, participants, agendas, and physical accommodations. The next two sections of this report deal with invitations and participation and with procedures at the Forums. At this point, it may only be mentioned that there were a number of minor problems but everything actually came together and the Forums were conducted as planned.

What should happen at the Forums was a subject for lengthy deliberation in the Steering Committee and later in the Advisory Committees. Although, with certain reservations the most important of which was that there should be ample provision for small group discussion, the director and the research assistant wanted to give considerable freedom to the authors and the Advisory Committees to make their own arrangements, in the end the Forums all followed very much the same format. Consensus on format evolved in part because most committee members did seem to have a similar perspective but also in part because so much of the actual preparation had to be carried out by the research assistant. The final format seemed to be a compromise between the original assembly idea and the feeling which grew up later about the need for participation: there would be formal presentations, but the largest blocks of time would be devoted to small group discussions. To provide for presentations, discussions, feedback, and some relaxed mingling, the Forums were planned as all-day affairs, beginning at nine in the morning and continuing through the dinner hour. For each Forum, participation would be limited to fifty to seventy members with discussion sections of not more than twenty members. Planning for the Forums went fairly smoothly with one exception. The question of closure for the Forums was never satisfactorily resolved for all members and repeatedly was raised in Advisory Committee meetings. The director felt strongly that any recommendations for "next steps" to follow the Forums would have to come from participants. In any case, the project in and of itself had no resources to move toward the larger project goals. It was hoped that participants would find the day-long sessions valuable and, if so, would be able to suggest ways and means

of continuing the process. Some members of the Advisory Committees found this "open-endedness" unsatisfactory. They felt that participants would expect some concrete outcome and would be disappointed and perhaps angry if nothing of that sort could be promised. This issue was never resolved. The Goals Project investigators were careful to stress their inability to implement suggestions, but at the same time called for recommendations for further action at each Forum. The only part of the agenda which remained largely in the hands of the authors of the background papers was the final after-dinner summary and discussion. What actually happened at the Forums will be the subject of most of the remainder of this report.

Linkages: In most of the description of the early phases of the Goals project, attention has been on internal variables. The project, however, relied very heavily on the federal government for funding, and, of course, would not have been able to proceed at all without cooperation of members of the Pittsburgh community. Monies from the Office of Education were only sufficient to carry the project through the early phases--up to the point, when, it was hoped, the policy centers or some equivalent could be brought into being through the cooperative efforts of several segments of the community. When the Office of Education had to cut back on some of its research grants, the University-Urban Interface Program was curtailed in terms of both time and money. This meant that the Goals Project also had to speed up operations and was deprived of some resources. At one point, the Steering Committee had considered waiting for the results of the survey, which dealt in part with priorities on urban problems, before making final decisions on Forum topics. This would have ensured choosing topics of vital interest to the local community, but the plan had to be abandoned when the grant was curtailed.

As for members of the community, they did come to the Forums and become intensely involved in the discussion. The degree of participation will be discussed below. Getting the appropriate people, usually with busy schedules, to participate in day-long working sessions of this kind is a difficult task. To some degree, it seems to require a "personal touch"--knowing the community and the people in it well. The project director had this kind of personal acquaintance, and it was extended through involving community representatives on the Advisory Committees. Even so, it was sometimes necessary to fall back on lists of agencies and individuals to find the broad representation called for in the project program. Drawing heavily upon personal acquaintance naturally involves some bias. In a large community, no one knows everyone, and individuals do not necessarily agree on whom it would be "important" to invite. Nevertheless, having personal knowledge of individuals involved, does tend to give (under favorable circumstances) potential participants a measure of trust that the time spent will be worthwhile, and it seems to have been used to good effect on the Goals Project. The people involved in developing invitation lists for the Forums were aware, however, that some invitees would in all probability be unable or unwilling to attend. Invitation lists were therefore purposely over-extended with the result that, in general, the desired number and mix of representatives was attained for all Forums.

Participation at the Forums: Invitations and Attendance

Invitation lists were drawn up for each Forum by the Steering Committee and the Advisory Committee for the particular Forum. Invitations were then extended to those on the lists in a letter signed by the Chancellor of the University. As has been mentioned, the response which would be made to invitations was crucial for the project. Invitations were

therefore extended mainly to people who could be identified with the problem on the agenda. Another attempt at ensuring interest was made by emphasizing a "specialness" of the Forums in contrast to other conferences. The letter emphasized the need for cooperation on solving urban problems, the involvement of many different groups, and the opportunity for participating in the discussion for all who attended the Forums. The letter, altered slightly for each Forum, also described the auspices under which the Forums were being held and outlined the problem focus. Those who accepted the invitation were subsequently sent a more detailed letter along with an agenda for the day and the background paper.

The following table* shows the distribution by number of those who were invited to each Forum, and by number and percentage, those who accepted, those who registered, and those who stayed all day. The last column contains the ratio between those who registered and those who stayed all day. The data in the tables are limited to individuals outside the universities. As can be seen, there was somewhat uneven success among

Participation By Forum

	Invited	Accepted	Registered	All Day	Ratio of All Day to Registration
Forum I: Conflict Utilization	73	35 (48%)	27 (37%)	17 (23%)	17/27 = 63%
Forum II: Administration of Justice	78	43 (55%)	37 (47%)	20 (26%)	20/37 = 54%
Forum III: The Domain of Health	71	44 (62%)	43 (61%)	34 (52%)	37/43 = 86%
Forum IV: Goals and Government of the Metropolis	88	38 (43%)	25 (28%)	13 (15%)	13/25 = 52%

*Barbara Jameson of the University-Urban Interface Program collected and classified the information for tables on participation.

the four Forums in getting the desired participants to attend, as well as to stay for the entire day. The relatively high turnout and retention for the Forum on health may well have been related to the fact that the University of Pittsburgh is itself very heavily involved in health services. People were probably more likely to come to this Forum in part because they hoped to be able to have some impact on the University's handling of health care. According to the reports of participant observers, it was in this Forum that the most specific and insistent demands were made, even in the after-dinner session which had been relatively quiet in the other Forums.

The hope of having an impact, however, cannot be seen as the only incentive for participation according to the figures in the table. The Forum on the Administration of Justice was also well attended (although fewer participants remained all day), and the University has relatively very little direct impact in this area. It does train students in its School of Law and has recently begun a program in the Administration of Justice, but the degree of involvement is not at all comparable to that in health. According to the Nehnevajsa survey, both the delivery of health services and the administration of justice had been chosen by 90 per cent of the respondents as among the top ten areas in which change was vital.* In contrast to these two topics which are quite concrete and evidently very timely in Pittsburgh, conflict utilization was a more abstract issue. Somewhat less than two-fifths of the people invited actually attended this conference, although most of those who came did stay all day. The Forum on Goals and Government was least well attended.

---

*These data have been cited in several places. For this statistic, see, for example, page 12 in Steele Gow and Leslie Salmon-Cox, A University and Its Community Confront Problems and Goals, University-Urban Interface Program, Office of the Secretary, University of Pittsburgh, June, 1972.

Two-thirds of the Goals Survey respondents had felt this was an urgent area for change, indicating a consensus somewhat lower than that on health and justice, but still very high. (Gow and Salmon-Cox, 1972:13) However, there was a concrete reason for the low attendance at this Forum. After the fourth Forum had already been planned and scheduled, another conference on government was organized for Pittsburgh. This conference was to last two days, one day overlapping with the Forum, and the Governor of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania was slated to attend. It was initially hoped that little conflict would develop between the two meetings and that, in fact, possibly one would generate more interest in the other. However, as it turned out, the Governor unexpectedly made a presentation at the other conference on the same day that the Forum was held, and a number of participants were drained away, or, at best, divided their time between the two affairs. This conflict helps to explain not only the relatively low attendance, but also the fairly wide discrepancy between acceptance and actual registration at the Goals and Government Forum. Such a discrepancy also occurred at the Conflict Utilization Forum, although no directly conflicting event was identified. It may be that people will sometimes accept invitations but remain open to other options, unless they are persuaded that the particular event is of vital importance. In the case of the Forums on Justice and Health, almost everyone who accepted an invitation registered, but this was not true for the other two Forums.

Another way of looking at the data on participation is by category of participant.* For the table below, individuals were classified according to affiliation, and the columns show the number from each category who were invited, followed by the number and per cent of those who accepted,

---

*The categories used here are taken from Jiri Nehnevajsa, Pittsburgh: Goals and Futures, Chapter 3, Part I, University of Pittsburgh: University-Urban Interface Program, January, 1973.

registered, and stayed all day at the Forums. The last column depicts the ratio between those who stayed all day and those who registered. The table includes all four Forums and again excludes the universities.

Invitation, Acceptance, Registration, Stayed All day at the Forums--By Affiliation

	Invited	Accepted	Registered	All Day	Ratio of All Day to Registration
Government/Law	107	47 (44%)	31 (29%)	14 (13%)	14/31 = 45%
Business/Banking	30	12 (40%)	8 (27%)	6 (20%)	6/8 = 75%
Education (non-university)	12	6 (50%)	4 (33%)	4 (33%)	4/4 = 100%
Health	62	42 (68%)	41 (61%)	32 (51%)	32/41 = 78%
Housing/Development	13	5 (38%)	3 (23%)	1 (08%)	1/3 = 33%
Anti-Pollution/Welfare	24	13 (54%)	13 (54%)	10 (42%)	10/13 = 33%
Black Programs	21	5 (24%)	5 (24%)	2 (10%)	2/5 = 40%
Religious	10	6 (60%)	5 (50%)	2 (20%)	2/5 = 40%
Media	23	19 (83%)	18 (78%)	12 (52%)	12/18 = 67%
Miscellaneous	8	5 (62%)	4 (50%)	4 (50%)	4/4 = 100%
Totals	310	160 (52%)	132 (43%)	87 (28%)	

Among the larger groups represented, people from the news media and from health were the most likely to actually register at the Forums if invited and they were also comparatively very likely to stay all day. Those who were invited from the media often played a double role; that is, they were participants in the discussions but they were also collecting information for their occupational roles. This ability to serve a double function may account for the high participation rates of media representatives. The area of health included everyone connected with health care and services outside the University, from physicians and dentists to community health workers. Their rate of participation was also relatively high, and this was probably for the same reasons that the Forum on health was so well attended. Relatively low participation rates

were recorded for Black Programs, Housing/Development, and Business/Banking. It may be that the topics of the Forums did not appeal to the special interests of these groups. In the case of Black Programs, it was not a matter of blacks generally not attending the Forums. Black persons were well represented both on the Advisory Committees and in the Forums themselves. However, they were mostly from the areas of health and low and from the universities and were thus tabulated as members of these groups and not under Black Programs. Government/Law also had a low participation rate. This seems to have been mainly because of the conflict in connection with the Goals and Government Forum where many politicians attended the other conference. It is possible, too, that some politicians avoided the Goals Forum, not because of a lack of interest but because it would be politically risky to express their views on metropolitan government there. In any case, politicians as a group may be very difficult to recruit, since they are invited to many meetings and conferences.

For all except the four groups mentioned above, participation rates reached a third or more and could be termed reasonably satisfactory. The table shows that there was considerable attrition in many groups by the end of the day. According to the observers' reports, most people who registered stayed through the late afternoon feedback session when all the groups joined to report on the day's discussion. The feedback session was followed by a social hour and dinner, at which the final count of participants was made. Those who left the Forums tended to go during or before the social hour. As will be discussed in the next section, most participants at the Forums took a lively and involved stance, and they were probably quite tired by four o'clock. Perhaps some of them perceived the remainder of the day as "trimming" even though an after-dinner plenary session was explicitly planned. In any case, the sharp

attrition does give rise to the impression that it is unrealistic to expect an eleven or twelve hour continuous involvement from many people and that some other mode of handling closure earlier in the day would have had better participation.

Personal contact or colleagueship was evidently helpful in bringing people to the Forums: invitees from Pittsburgh and other local universities responded well. (Most university invitees were from the University of Pittsburgh, but Carnegie-Mellon and Duquesne faculty members were also included.) Leaving out all individuals who were in any way connected with the University-Urban Interface Program, 70 per cent of those in the universities who received invitations accepted, and actually a few more registered than had been on the invitation lists. In fact, in the case of representatives of the universities, there was somewhat a problem in reverse. University people often requested an invitation to one Forum or another, and some of these requests were difficult to turn down. Since the investigators had planned from the beginning to keep the ratio between university and community participants weighted toward the community side, and also to limit the number of persons in each Forum, only a limited number of requests could be honored. Although there may have been some hard feelings, a balance was maintained in community favor in all Forums, although only in the Health and Goals and Government Forums was this balance at about the two-to-one ratio deemed optimal.

In summary, bringing really concerned and involved people to attend conferences of this sort is a difficult task and requires considerable care. All the talent and information which can be mobilized to choose timely topics, create the right atmosphere, and exercise personal and

colleagual influence is needed to achieve the degree of participation and "mix" of participants desirable. The most complete participation came from those groups who seemed to have some special extra reason to be interested in the Forums: the media because of their occupational interests, the health people because of the involvement of the University of Pittsburgh in health care and services, and the university members because it was an "in-house" effort with sufficient academic and scientific content to encourage their interest.

A few words should be said about the level of the participants. Forum invitations were extended to a broad social spectrum ranging from high officials and executives to representatives of the community's disadvantaged. These community representatives were not, however, randomly selected citizens but community workers (from various social agencies) who were based in disadvantaged areas. As compared to the invitation list, actual participants showed some shrinkage at the top: proportionately fewer of the high officials and executives who were invited came than those either in more middle-level positions or those who were representatives of the disadvantaged (although some of the "top" level people did send their representatives). The consequences of this selective participation and the fact that invitations were issued to agency workers rather than members of disadvantaged groups were that participants were skewed somewhat toward a narrower, middle-livel representation than originally intended. How this outcome affected the course of events at the Forums would be impossible to determine. The reality seems to be that, compared to figures in the highest positions, those who occupy more middle-range positions have both more time and interest to give to efforts of this sort. With respect to community members, on the other hand, it seems arguable

that working with representatives of organizations rather than random individuals would be more conducive to pulling together a broad base for action on a given problem. But are these the people who can "get things done"? They do seem to have proved that they can work together seriously and harmoniously. Beyond that, it would seem to rest on the degree to which they are accepted as legitimate representatives of the organizations and groups for which they stand.

At the Forums: From the Notes of Participant Observers

The Forums which were held for the Community Long-Range Goals Project were held in the Fall of 1971 and early Winter of 1972. The final dates and topics were as follows:

Thursday, October 21, 1971: Conflict Management

Thursday, November 18, 1971: Administration of Justice

Thursday, December 9, 1971: Distribution of Health Services

Thursday, February 24, 1972: Metro Government

The procedures followed for each Forum were very similar. The participants arrived around nine o'clock in the morning to be registered, received group assignments, and met over a cup of coffee. After about a half an hour, the entire group moved to a "lecture room" (one of the hotel banquet rooms which had been rearranged with rows of chairs facing the front of the room). The day officially began with welcoming remarks by the Chancellor, followed by brief remarks by the chief investigator of the University-Urban Interface Program and the director of the Goals Project. After the opening speeches, some of the data from the Pittsburgh Goals Survey were presented by the faculty member who conducted the survey.

The author or authors of the background paper for the topic of the day then spoke about their papers, summarizing the content and highlighting some of the problems raised. After the presentations, the research assistant for the Goals Project made a few additional remarks about what would happen during the day, and then gave directions to the rooms where small group meetings were held. Small group discussion sessions occupied a large part of the day, lasting altogether around four hours, broken by a lunch period. At four o'clock, all participants reconvened in the lecture room and feedback was offered on the discussion sessions from each of the groups by a recorder chosen in the group for this purpose. The day ended with a social hour, dinner, and a plenary session. Discussion members were assigned to their groups and remained in the same groups before and after luncheon; however, at lunch and dinner, seating was by choice to allow for more mingling across groups.

The University-Urban Interface Program sent members of the research staff as participant observers to stay all day at each of the four Forums. Since the research staff was small, it was not possible to provide an observer in every discussion group (there were either three or four such groups in each Forum). However, there was always one observer who was assigned to a discussion group and who went through the day in the same fashion as any other participant. There was also always one observer who "floated", that is, moved about from group to group during the day in order to compare the activities in the several groups. In all except the first Forum, it was possible to send at least one additional observer. All observers were briefed on the kinds of observations which would be most useful. They kept notes during the day and then wrote detailed reports on the day's experiences. In all, thirteen reports were completed. The

material from these reports has been drawn upon to form the composite picture of what happened in the Forums which follows. The major parts of the day will be described, using observations from all four Forums. A final section will discuss some of the major themes from participant observer reports.

In the Lecture Room: All the observers felt that most people listened attentively to the presentations and showed interest in the material. Speakers were frequently awarded warm applause. In no case, however, were questions raised from the audience. Reactions to what happened there, as a consequence, had to be gleaned from remarks and comments made in the lecture room when the presentations were over, in the halls on the way to group assignments, and in the discussion groups themselves. One of the problems that authors of the background papers faced was that of reaching a heterogeneous audience. Although papers were commissioned especially for the Forums and were to be written for a varied audience, some participants still complained that they were too "academic" and proved that faculty members did not know how to "talk to people". Others felt that the presentations were too long, and were heard to protest that they had come to be discussants and not to be "talked at". These complaints were heard more commonly in the first two Forums, where papers were late in being brought to completion. Although it had been planned to send out papers well in advance to all participants, the first two papers only arrived a few days beforehand. Aware of this problem, authors made lengthy and detailed presentations. Not all members of this mixed audience found it easy to sit still during the hour and one-half which was consumed in the lecture room. There were fewer such comments in the last two Forums, where the presentations were shorter, and the papers, in any case, were apparently better received.

A related but more basic and commonly heard theme, however, in all four Forums was domination by the university in the early part of the program. Participants felt that other groups should have been consulted in planning the Forums or at least as speakers to present views other than those of university people. Criticism of the university also arose in connection with the Goals Survey. People generally seemed to listen eagerly to presentations about the survey. Yet in discussion groups, there were many questions raised, particularly about the sample. People wanted to know how the sample was drawn, and some were frankly skeptical about its representativeness. A few stated baldly that university members did not know enough about the Pittsburgh community to draw up a sample which would be truly inclusive of all the relevant groups. Since questions of this nature were not raised with the speakers in the lecture room, there was no opportunity to try to satisfy them. The observer reports indicate that only a minority were vocally unhappy about the early part of the Forums, but for these individuals the day started "wrong" because it was a one-sided performance in which they had no part. The Steering Committee for the project had moved from the large, formal assembly milieu to the smaller, more discussion-oriented assemblies in order to give all participants a chance to have their say. But at the events, some were saying that this kind of participation should have begun earlier--that community groups should have been involved from the beginning in the planning and the program.

The Discussion Groups: A group leader was appointed in advance for each discussion group, and each group had a recorder from the University of Pittsburgh, and also chose a community recorder from its ranks to make a report in the feedback sessions. According to observer reports, some

group leaders were more directive than others, summarizing and clarifying points and calling on speakers in turn. Others were inclined to sit back once the sessions were begun and let the conversations flow. In any case, group discussions were launched and sustained with little difficulty. Participants at the Forums took the subjects seriously and discussion in all sections was lively with all or most members joining in freely. Attempts to dominate groups by a single speaker or small group were few and usually ended quite quickly since, if the leader did not intervene, other group members did. Different viewpoints were certainly expressed and there were some heated exchanges, but with the exception of a few incidents, discourse in all Forums remained good-natured. Observers remarked that people seemed pleasantly surprised at how well they could get along, given their different viewpoints, and the often sensitive topics. In the Administration of Justice Forum, racism was a fairly prevalent theme which even led to a mini-confrontation in one group. There was also a black caucus during the luncheon period and some discussion of a "walk-out". In the end, however, everyone stayed, even those who had been most outspoken, and the day ended peacefully. Interestingly enough, in the Health Forum the major theme was not race but rather the disadvantaged, both black and white, against the rest of society. Here, black and white workers in poverty neighborhoods tended to join together to chastise the establishment for not getting the "services out there". The tone was not abrasive, however, but rather calm and constructive, and it was in this Forum that the most concrete recommendations in the greatest number were brought to the feedback and the plenary sessions.

Group leaders and university recorders were not given very much prior instruction. The discussion sessions were to be informal and flexible,

rather than structured. On the whole, this seems to have worked well, although group leaders sometimes did not have sufficient information to answer questions about the University-Urban Interface Program or the Goals Project and its purposes. Observer reports showed that in every group in which an observer was present, certain questions were raised and never satisfactorily answered. People asked: Why are we really here; what are we accomplishing; what will be done with the recommendations which come out of the day's work? Even though the project investigators took early and increasingly more explicit care to point out that neither UUIP nor the University could take responsibility for implementing the solutions to problems offered at the Forums, it was never possible to dispel the belief of some participants that something concrete would be offered up by the end of the day. There were sometimes angry comments about "just wasting money which could be put to work on real problems," "trying to use us (community participants) in some scheme to raise more money for the University," and so on. In one group, the University-Urban Interface Program was accused of being "racist", and a resolution was offered to call on the Office of Education to suspend the program. Black spokesmen, in fact, were the most likely to feel that they were always used and being used again. Comments and accusations as they occurred were parried, and nothing actually disruptive occurred. Yet, it is important to recognize that a host institution will encounter problems about motives. This would not apply only to a university, for many social institutions were sharply criticized in the Forums. And it seems very likely that a host institution will also be expected to formulate next steps, no matter what its disclaimers. Never in any of the sessions was it suggested that some participants might go out of the Forums to try to interest other groups and

agencies in carrying on the work which had begun there. Yet many said they thought it should be carried on. Many participants, accustomed to conferences, obviously did not have great expectations for anything more than an exchange of ideas. However, it did seem to be precisely among those groups who were not in the past represented in councils--the groups that the project was most anxious to reach--that the most pressures for concrete action and the most disappointment were generated. The project director had dropped the idea of using the Community Policy Research Center proposal as a topic of a Forum because he believed that ideas for next steps should come from the participants rather than be imposed upon them. Participants reiterated that the University must work "with the community not for it" and complained that community groups were not involved in planning the Forums. Yet, in the end, it was obviously expected that the University would take the lead and carry on the process it had initiated. The only help that was ever offered was that participants could be called upon as consultants in whatever the University did in solving urban problems.

Luncheon, Dinner, and the Social Hour: Participants were encouraged to mix in any manner they chose for these parts of the program. Indeed, the observer reports demonstrate fairly clearly that people moved out of their own discussion group membership and mingled across groups. In almost all reports, however, a rather curious observation was repeated. In spite of the intensity of the interaction in the discussion sections, the topics of the Forums were almost never discussed during luncheon, dinner, and the social hour. Perhaps people needed a respite from these concerns, and certainly the freedom allowed everyone present a chance to meet everyone else. In terms of working on the problems at hand, however, these seem to have been wasted periods.

Feedback Sessions: Almost everyone who appeared at the Forums at all stayed through the feedback sessions in the afternoon. Community recorders, in turn, gave their reports, which included recommendations for action which their groups had agreed were needed and viable. Some recorders repeated the uncertainty about the purposes of the Forums which had come up in discussion groups. Despite the earlier complaints of this kind, sometimes reflected in the recorders' reports, feedback sessions were low-keyed. Participants listened to the reports attentively and accepted them without comment or controversy. Comparing the material from the feedback sessions of the four Forums, it appeared that the one on Conflict Management was found the least useful by those who attended. People found the subject too vague, and the one concrete proposal contained in the background paper --for a course to teach people to use conflict in a positive manner--unacceptable. The other three Forums produced more in the way of concrete suggestions, and the recorders' reports indicate that participants were more likely to think that they had "something they could get their teeth into."

Although the role of the University was raised in some way in all four Forums, it was in the conference on the domain of health that the feedback sessions were most preoccupied with what the University of Pittsburgh could and should do. This was not surprising since, as has been mentioned, the University is very much involved in the health area and also since the paper for this Forum discussed the interface between the University and the community in connection with health care. However, pressures on the University to do more in the community and to bring community representatives into planning and policy-making in the University became so insistent that some consternation was felt by University administrators. It seemed clear that community people could not believe that a

Forum on health, held by the University, at which the Chancellor made a presentation, and at which representatives from the School of Medicine and the School of Public Health were present would not produce some immediate results. In other feedback sessions, recommendations were likely to be aimed at other groups in addition to the University, and the University was somewhat more likely to be seen in a mediating or advisory role rather than an implementing one. Evidently, when an institution plays host to a conference about services it is itself responsible for, it runs a grave risk of being pushed into an awkward position. Ironically, it was this Forum which had the best attendance and where interest was sustained through the very end. In some ways, then, it was the "best" Forum, and at the same time, the one in which it was the most difficult to maintain the stance that the Forums were for the purpose of bringing groups together to think about what could be done rather than to actually get things done.

The feedback sessions were useful in bringing together the threads of the day's discussions and in allowing participants to learn about what was going on in groups other than their own. They were well attended and, in all but one case, effectively constituted the end of the working day. What was surprising, given some of the comments in discussion groups, was that questions were not raised from the floor. Goals Project and University-Urban Interface Program personnel were present and visible, but they were not asked for further clarification. Perhaps the participants thought the recorders' reports spoke for them. Many may well have been satisfied with the intellectual exchange of the day, and the promise that they would receive a summary report on the Forums when the series was completed.

Plenary Sessions: The after-dinner plenary sessions for three Forums consisted of only rather brief summaries of the events of the day with little or no further discussion. Many participants had already left, and those who remained did not seem interested in raising further points. It had been a long day. The Health Forum plenary session was different. Most participants remained and a continuation of the feedback session occurred. The major author of the background paper had worked hard with group leaders and recorders during the social hour to pull together a summary of major points. In the plenary session he presented this summary and again raised the issue of the interface between the university and the community. It was in this session that a recommendation was made from the floor for a planning center or centers which was similar to the idea of policy research centers. The planning centers were to include representatives of the community and the University to work together on a continuous basis. As a first step, community participants suggested using representatives at the Forum as a nucleus of community representatives. They also suggested that a second Forum should be held in a half year or so which would be convened to discuss what had been accomplished on these recommendations. All of these suggestions, however, were more or less dropped on the University's doorstep. Since no one on the Goals Project could promise that any of these suggestions would be taken up, this session, like the other plenary sessions, seemed to end on a note of "unfinished business".

Major Themes in the Observers' Reports: The Forums were a success in that people from different segments of the community were brought together, engaged in serious discussion, and obviously listened to one another's viewpoints. That the proceedings were generally so amiable with such a diverse population was very encouraging. Evidently people from different

groups with different interests can work together, given problems of importance to them all. The participants themselves expressed pleasure and sometimes surprise that the discussions were so lively and went so well.

Two major problems persisted through the four events. One was the degree of community involvement. Many felt that the University had been too central in planning the Forums and the program, particularly the formal presentations. It seemed evident that any institution which played host in this sort of effort would have to be prepared to "take it" in a number of ways. A degree of mistrust for many social institutions was expressed in the Forums which suggested that, while individuals might cooperate in working on problems together, no organization could mount a first step without being liable to suspicion. Not only did participants say that the University was remiss in not involving other community groups from the start on the Goals Project, but some also felt that the University was using the events for some hidden purposes of its own. At the same time, it turned out that people who attended the Forums expected the University to continue the process. In some way, then, it seemed that the University was to bear the expense and responsibility for all that was undertaken, yet not make any moves without consulting others.

The second problem that was evident in all four Forums was a sense of incompleteness. People came to the Forums, listened to the presentations, worked together on the problems set out, and finally put together lists of recommendations. Yet, not everyone was satisfied that anything had really been accomplished. At the Health Forum the insistence on more concrete results was at its height, but in every Forum this problem came up. This was also a dilemma related to the appropriate role the University should take and how much leadership should be undertaken by the Goals Project.

It was, however, from a purely practical standpoint also impossible for the Goals Project to assume the responsibility for further action without additional resources. These were not at this point forthcoming from the University, nor were any suggestions made about getting help from community sources. Thus the Forums ended for many with a sense of uncertainty and for some even with a sense of frustration.

The Social Climate at the Forums: Reports by participant observers, as has been related, showed the Forums to be lively affairs, particularly in the discussion groups where ideas and information were freely exchanged. Almost everyone who came to the group sessions made contributions to the discussion, and there were only a few instances of temporary "takeover" by an individual or sub-group. There were some heated exchanges and even one mini-confrontation, but on the whole, discussion was fairly amiable. People disagreed, arguments occurred, but there were few angry outbursts and no walkouts. This cooperative multi-group behavior, however, was interlaced with statements which sometimes indicated a high level of mistrust, disillusion, and a sense of injustice, particularly in the area of resource distribution. A closer look at the distribution of these underlying themes, in contrast to more positive ones, may help to give a more sensitive impression of the spirit in which participants approached the call for multi-group cooperation on urban problems.

From the written records of the Forums, it was possible to collect a large "sample" of individual comments, suitable for content analysis. Each sub-group in each Forum had a recorder from the university, and these records were submitted following the Forums to the project organizers. In taking down remarks, most recorders tended to identify the speaker, either by name or by organizational affiliation. Statements which were

incomplete or fragmentary or which were not identified in such a way as to allow the speaker to be classified had to be discarded. However, there remained 380 usable "bits" of information of an average of 24 words each.* Under the conditions of the Forums, it is quite evident that what was taken down and what was missed is pretty much up to chance. However, when the pieces were classified according to the category from which they originated, it did appear that there was a fairly good sampling of each group when number of bits contributed are compared with category size. The table below shows the distribution of information collected by recorders by category. The classification was altered slightly from that used for attendance at the Forums. Three small groups, Housing/Development, Anti-Pollution/Welfare, and Black Programs were combined into one category labeled Welfare and Social Action, and under this label it was possible also to include three of the miscellaneous participants. On the other hand, the category Government/Law was subdivided into two in order to differentiate between those engaged in law enforcement and law services from politicians. In this way, nine categories emerged for the content analysis procedure which will be described below. Two of these groups, however, were so very small both in numbers of representatives and "bits" collected that they are only included as very marginal indicators of local feeling in those groups when confronted with social problems. These two groups were from religion, that is, from the churches, and education outside the universities, e.g., school board representatives, teachers. The table shows that an average of about 1.7 bits of information were collected per

---

*The word count did not include the articles "the" or "a" or "an". Hyphenated words were counted as one; comments were sometimes added by recorders in parentheses to put a reference in context. Although these certainly added to clarity, they were not included in the word count.

group when divided by number of representatives. The only rather startling statistic is that under one bit per representative was collected for the universities. Although university representatives were often exhorted to "listen to the community", and some obviously tried hard to exercise restraint, it is not the impression in the reports of the observers that

Recorded Data "Bits" by Category

	Registered	Number "Bits"	Approximate "Bits" Average
Universities	95	82	1.0
Health	41	99	2.5
Law/Law Enforcement	23	65	3.0
Politicians	8	29	3.5
Welfare/Social Action	24	42	2.0
Media	18	27	1.5
Business	9	18	2.0
Education	4	10	2.5
Religion	5	8	1.5
	227	380	

Overall average = 1.7

they were relatively quiet compared with other groups. It may have been that there was some systematic bias on the part of the recorders to emphasize community input. It also may have been in part that university representatives made more complex and abstract comments which were hard to record. In several places in recorders' notes, there are objections to too much "theoretical" discussion, yet nowhere are the formulations which aroused these objections recorded. Whatever the bases of distortions in recording, and there must be many, the notes of the recorders are the only evidence available on group sentiments in the Forums.

For content analysis of the bits, a return was made to the institution-building framework which was used to discuss the organization of the project. The six major variables are used but in a somewhat different way

than was employed for internal organization and activities. Since the whole thrust of the Goals Project was toward the possibility of implementing cooperative action between different organizations and groups in the community, it is mainly the inter-group climate which is the focus of attention here. The six variables consequently have been reformulated to focus mainly on inter-group exchange. The linkage concept is discarded because its utility lies in identifying input-output relationships between one particular institution, organization, or group, and the relevant units in its environment. In contrast in this analysis the attention is on multi-group interaction bases without concern for any functions one group might be serving for another.

The recorded pieces contain substantive material--attitudes, opinions, information--which were scrutinized for their significance in terms of the potential for cooperative action. Six dimensions for coding were operationalized, and these are described below with examples from the data. It must be noted that the dimensions are not mutually exclusive. Any given recorded bit could include reference to none of the dimensions or to all six. Some of the bits were complicated, some were quite simple. Each was taken as recorded as a contribution of one speaker in one speech. The examples used below sometimes include entire "bits" and sometimes only the relevant part.

Doctrine: The most significant dimension in view of project goals is cooperation-conflict. Any statement which implied a cooperative model, which gave examples of how groups do work together or should work together was coded "1". Any statement which implied a conflict model, which gave examples of inter-group tension or lack of cooperation or

cited conflict as the mechanism for change was coded "2". Individual or intra-group strains or cohesiveness are not coded here but under Personnel. Mention of conflict simply as a phenomenon without specific referents or no mention of either conflict or cooperation was coded "0".

Examples of cooperation from the data:

> Involve different groups in the process of justice. Ask those who don't agree with one another. Educate some of these groups so that they can help the liberals push for legislative reform.

> One alternative is the University of Miami model where a private corporation built facilities and the University staffed a medical service institution.

> The legislature is not able to always change corruption in the local areas. The university should make its experts available to legislators or lobbyists for facts and recommendations by setting up a clearinghouse.

Examples of conflict from the data:

> Ideas are formed at different sources but they are not passed on. Community groups may learn something in their efforts, but they do not share it with others.

> You have to remember the conflict of interest between the public and private sectors. If public services are offered in some areas, physicians will complain.

> External change creates internal conflict which forces the re-thinking of goals and programs.

Theme: An important ingredient for determining whether or not people will work together to solve social problems would seem to be a degree of optimism or belief that "something

can be done". The dimension here then is optimism-pessimism. Statements which indicated that something can/is being done to remedy some situation or that change for the better is in process even in small ways were coded "1". Statements which indicated a feeling of stalemate or regression or hopelessness about accomplishing anything because certain conditions exist were coded "2". Statements about what should be done which contained no indications of positive expectations or statements which made no reference to optimism-pessimism in any way were coded "0".

Examples of optimism from data:

> I think "fishbowl management" is the coming thing, where everyone can see what is going on. The goal is the greatest good for the greatest number.

> A bill is now before the legislature to require minimal educational standards for the police. Word is that it will pass. We do have some 500 young men graduating in police science (from community colleges).

> In my opinion new leadership will learn to work within a decentralized system. Politics may be changing but it is still the main source of hope for the citizens.

Examples of pessimism from data:

> Who has power anywhere? A small urban community has its own powers and must be dealt with. They won't give up this power voluntarily and there is no present legislation to force them.

> There are more and more demands, but all the budgets are being cut back.

> The problem in general is that the racial problem is here for as long as you live. I am always considered a black woman--not a woman first, but a black woman.

Leadership: The dimension chosen here was egalitarian-elitist, and had to do with sentiments about the appropriate distribution of power. Statements which pressed for broader distribution or maintained that leadership must be in the hands of the people or that those affected must have participation in decisions were coded "1". Statements which affirmed that leadership must or should come from the top or that one has to go to the top for effective action were coded "2". Insofar as no leaning either way was indicated, or no mention was made of this dimension, statements were coded "0".

Examples of egalitarian from data:

Popular participation must reach the level where groups have organization and clout. What has to be discovered is the means by which such units can evolve to work on such problems.

To change feelings of frustration and alienation of non-whites, change power relations between white and non-white communities so that they have a more equal impact on creation of law and on enforcement. How? Organize non-whites and educate them to make them more effective and realistic.

If the University decided to have Forums, it should have included more grass-roots citizens. These are the people whose needs are greatest.

Examples of elitist from data:

The problem is that the people who can make changes are not those who are here discussing them. This includes legislators, the district attorney, member of the Criminal Division of Common Pleas, etc.

Going back to the community seems to be just an alibi for not getting things done. We get stuck on arguing about mechanims but not on how to solve problems. We still only have politicians to solve problems, but they are being bypassed. Instead endless so-called community groups and leaders turn up and only confusion results.

We need to make more use of information science. How do people obtain and make use of information? For these sessions we are missing persons who are really high level, should get two or three of them to join.

Personnel: This was one dimension which referred explicitly to intra-organizational or intra-group or individual issues. Statements which suggested that lower-status members within groups were included in decision-making or had special membership rights or privileges were coded as "1". References to individuals as being included in decision-making without any particular categorical status being mentioned were also coded "1". References to exclusion of lower-status members from decision-making or that they are not treated as full members were coded as "2". Similarly, mention of exclusion of individuals without categorical reference were coded as "2". No mention of this dimension of inclusiveness-exclusiveness at the intra-group or individual level were coded as "0".

Examples of <u>inclusiveness</u> from data:

People can be trained to think differently even when the institution itself appears to be conservative, for example, through contact between students and professors and with other segments of the University.

The training at the police academy really turned things around for me. I was better educated now, and I could deal with the lawyers in court.

Most people see policemen, that is, they see the uniform first, then color. They don't see the color difference first.

Examples of <u>exclusiveness</u> from data:

Team practice might be more economical, but it would get more acceptance if it was really practiced, not just given lip service.

The School of Nursing has been operating a satellite clinic which is designed to take some of the load off the doctor. Medical personnel other than doctors can provide many accessory health services, besides making referrals. Yet, it seems, people do not want to see a nurse, they want to see a doctor.

We have learned to rely on the expert. How can we be sure a nurse is doing the right thing?

Resources: The dimension used here is attitudes toward the distribution of resources. Statements which indicate that there is a fair or satisfactory distribution of money, facilities, services, etc. were coded "1". Statements which indicate an unfair or unsatisfactory distribution of resources were coded "2". No mention of resources or mention without implications of fairness-unfairness, satisfactory-unsatisfactory were coded "0".

Examples of <u>fair/satisfactory</u> from the data:

There are various programs in the University which are already providing services and information for the community.

We're moving toward the redistribution of wealth. Now we must deal with trade-offs.

Some corporations have provided health plans covering all their workers.

Examples of <u>unfair/unsatisfactory</u> from the data:

The way things are only some areas are getting good services.

People in the community just don't want to feel that they are being practiced on. But the main problem is how to deliver adequate services to all the taxpayers. Our people are not getting them.

Ninety per cent of the cops in the boroughs and townships are given a badge and a gun without any training. This is dangerous with the authority given. Most policemen are dedicated; however, better wages means a better calibre of men.

Organization: Since it appeared that trust between organizations (and their members) would be fundamental for cooperative action, the dimension trust-mistrust was coded here. Statements which indicated that organizations could or should be entrusted with particular missions or that they do perform particular missions in a reliable manner were coded "1". Statements which indicated mistrust of an organization's activities or motives or suggested that there has been a betrayal of trust by a particular organization were coded "2". When a particular figure or role incumbent was used to stand for an organization, e.g., chancellor for the university, in relation to trust-mistrust, it was coded as for an organization. No mention of this dimension, or mention of trust-mistrust in a general way without specific application was coded "0".

Examples of <u>trust</u> from the data:

> Keep the 129 small districts, but put, for example, the districts in the eastern portions under one council and impose a uniform property tax. The council would decide what to do with the money. If one district needs something, it must come from all.

> There could be more interaction between the schools and the university so that teachers could be retrained to relate to children.

> The only group that is really equipped for the rough and tumble is political leadership.

Examples of <u>mistrust</u> from the data:

> I am back at the point where it was said that leadership has to come from the politicians. Yet surveys show a great deal of pessimism, of lack of confidence in political leadership.

> If there is a Prevention Center (health area) under planning, who is involved? Who even decided that there was a need for a plan? The University needs to be more open, talk to those for whom services are planned.
>
> I still don't understand what is going on in here (in the Forums). I think the university is running scared and trying to put something over.

When the content analysis of the 380 bits was completed, a chart (see overleaf) was prepared to show the results. For each category involved, the percentage of "1", "2", and "0" was calculated and plotted across the horizontal for each of the six variables or dimensions. For each variable a fourth box was included which indicated the balance between, for example, cooperation, which was rated a plus, and conflict, which was rated as a minus. For each category, then, the fourth box on the horizontal on each dimension represents the difference between "1" and "2". If the "1" choices predominate, the balance is scored as a plus. If the "2" choices predominate, the balance is scored as a minus. A scan of the table shows, that in four of the seven groups with sufficient numbers of bits, cooperation scores predominated. Pessimism predominated in four of seven groups. Egalitarianism predominated in six of seven groups. Exclusionary statements predominated in five of seven groups. Dissatisfaction with resource distribution predominated in all seven groups. Mistrust predominated in six out of seven groups.

Looking at no mention scores, it can be seen that the fewest bits were recorded under Personnel which had to do with inclusion/exclusion on an intra-group or individual basis. There was great variety between groups in the extent to which they seemed to be preoccupied with particular dimensions within those chosen. The range of "no mentions" extends from 37 per cent to 61 per cent under Doctrine, from 39 per cent to 56 per cent under Theme, from 56 per cent to 72 per cent under Leadership, from 81 per cent

SOCIAL CLIMATE AT THE FORUMS (%)

	Doctrine				Theme				Leadership				Personnel				Resources				Organization			
	Cooperation	Conflict	No Mention	Balance	Optimism	Pessimism	No Mention	Balance	Egalitarianism	Elitism	No Mention	Balance	Included	Excluded	No Mention	Balance	Satisfied-Fair	Dissatisfied-Unfair	No Mention	Balance	Trust	Mistrust	No Mention	Balance
	+	-	0	+-	+	-	0	+-	+	-	0	+-	+	-	0	+-	+	-	0	+-	+	-	0	+-
University (N=82)	32	17	51	+15	27	17	56	+10	23	13	64	+10	06	12	82	-06	05	18	77	-13	20	23	57	-03
Health (N=99)	22	25	53	-03	24	37	39	-13	26	07	67	+19	04	12	84	-08	00	33	67	-33	07	36	57	-29
Government-Law (N=65)	20	26	54	-06	25	28	47	-03	25	18	57	+07	14	11	75	+03	04	26	70	-22	15	31	54	-16
Government-Pols (N=29)	36	24	40	+12	24	28	48	-04	28	10	62	+18	00	07	93	-07	03	38	59	-35	17	28	55	-11
Welfare/Social (N=42)	33	19	48	+14	21	33	46	-12	38	02	60	+36	05	14	81	-09	00	26	74	-26	14	48	38	-34
Media (N=27)	26	37	37	-11	26	22	52	+04	33	04	63	+29	00	11	89	-11	04	37	59	-33	19	44	37	-25
Business (N=18)	22	17	61	+04	33	22	45	+11	11	17	72	-06	11	06	83	+05	05	12	83	-07	17	11	72	+06
Education (N=10)	20	30	50	-10	20	50	30	-30	20	10	70	+10	30	10	60	+20	10	20	70	-10	10	20	70	-10
Religion (N=08)	37	37	26	00	37	50	13	-13	75	00	25	+75	00	13	87	-13	00	62	38	-62	12	50	38	-38

Total N=380

to 93 per cent under Personnel, from 59 per cent to 83 per cent under Resources, and from 37 per cent to 72 per cent under Organization.

Looking at the last section, Organization, of the table first, it can be seen that the social climate at the Forums included a fairly strong current of inter-group mistrust. Remarks indicating mistrust predominated over remarks indicating trust in six of the seven groups. This sentiment was particularly high among participants who had Health and Welfare/Social affiliations. Moving to the next section, Resources, dissatisfastion with distribution prevailed in all groups and was particularly strong in the same two groups which had high levels of mistrust statements. Participants from Health and Welfare/Social areas were quite likely to be community workers serving disadvantaged areas. They often felt that "their people" were short-changed and mistreated under present social arrangements. They also thought that those in charge of the distribution of resources had little concern for the impoverished generally and/or the blacks particularly. Media people were also high on both mistrust and dissatisfaction. Newspersons must know their community and what is going on in it. In the nature of things, they cannot be insulated from social problems, and they expressed many of the same sentiments as did those from Health and Welfare/Social areas. Other groups were somewhat more sanguine, but the general climate at the Forums reflects that discussed nationally in the last presidential campaign. It might be argued, however, that the Forums were especially geared toward the "negative" or problem aspect of the Pittsburgh situation and that a rosy picture could hardly have been anticipated. This reasoning applies better to the resource distribution area than it does to the dimension of trust-mistrust. In the latter, the implication is that certain institutions or groups are unwilling to change

the situation. It is not just that the present situation is bad, it is perhaps hopeless, since groups cannot be trusted to move toward amelioration. This feeling of hopelessness is also reflected, though imperfectly, under Theme where pessimism outweighs optimism in four of the seven groups. Yet the balance toward pessimism is not very strong, and it could be suggested that only a small minority of the participants really think that "nothing can be done".

On the more positive side, four of the seven groups favored a cooperative model of group interaction. Although the margins of cooperation over conflict were not very high, in the three groups where a conflict model predominated, the margins in two of the three were even lower. Six of the seven groups expressed sentiments which on balance favored egalitarianism. Participants espoused "opening up" the system so that more people would participate in decision-making. Although it can be seen under Personnel, that five out of seven groups felt that there was more exclusiveness than inclusiveness on the intra-group or individual level, there were too few remarks about this dimension overall to indicate that it was a central concern in the Forums.

The data collected in the recorders' reports, then, showed rather clearly that inter-group cooperation, while valued by many, has to evolve in a situation where mistrust and dissatisfaction are high, and where one group is likely to blame another for the problems that exist. Nevertheless, there was sufficient expression of good will and openness toward multi-group participation to indicate that the possibility of working together remains viable.

Perspectives on the University: In earlier sections on participation and social climate, it has been noted that mistrust was a strong ingredient

in discussions at the Forums. The University of Pittsburgh, as host, came in for considerable criticism and suspicion. It is possible that a university is not seen as the appropriate place from which to initiate efforts to mobilize inter-group cooperation on the local scene. Data from several sources are pulled together in this section to explore this particular question. The data apply only to universities in the Pittsburgh area, although it is quite probably that similar sentiments operate in the environments of other urban universities.

The first piece of information is taken from the Pittsburgh Goals Survey (Nehnevajsa, 1973). One hundred twenty-six community "influentials" responded to this questionnaire on problems and priorities in the Pittsburgh area. One question on the survey asked the respondent what measures he or she thought the universities in the area should take regarding the issues discussed. Content analysis of this question showed varying perspectives on the university role.* Given some of the comments in the Forums, it is interesting that almost all respondents regardless of group affiliation seemed to view the local universities as highly-respected institutions, whose voices would be easily received by the community. The majority of the respondents, in varying ways, characterized universities as mainly responsible for gathering and disseminating information. They saw university personnel as doing research on urban problems and teaching students and the public (officials, planners, and general citizenry) how to deal with them. Many thought the university should make an increasing effort to sensitize individuals to human needs. Interestingly enough, although

---

*Undertaken for this report by Christina Jarema of the University-Urban Interface Program.

the Forums had not yet been launched when the survey was conducted, quite a few respondents suggested that the university could serve as an organizer of public forums on urban problems. For most respondents, then, the University was perceived as a "knowledge pool" which could be shared more effectively with other segments of the community. Taking the lead in educating the public by one means or another is the most active stance most respondents advocated for a university.

But a minority of the respondents felt that the University should become an "action agent". Most of those working on black community programs and about half of those working in anti-poverty programs gave this kind of response. These respondents thought that faculty and students should be out in the community providing services to people, and that the universities should be establishing their own community programs. Some of these respondents felt that the University should use its money and influence to organize other segments of the community so that they could press for needed social innovations. Several perceived the universities as the logical prime movers for bringing about social change, if they would only assume the responsibility. As was indicated in the reports of observers at the Forums, it again appears to be those who work with minorities and the disadvantaged who most frequently call for "action" rather than words.

According to these data, the universities look like the logical bases to initiate group cooperation on urban problem-solving. They are also seen as places which contain the needed information to help people to understand what is going on and therefore move toward problem solution. Only a minority, however, seem to think that universities should take the lead in actually doing something about urban problems. In the public eye,

universities remain in the more traditional role of "educators" rather than "action agents", from what these respondents say.*

A second source of information about perspectives on the university's role was the reports of the university recorders in the Forums. A search for explicit mention of universities revealed 96 bits (25% of the total of 380) which could be so classified. These 96 bits were then analyzed on two dimensions. The first was any mention of what a university should be doing, using a dichotomy of research/teaching versus social action. About one-third of the bits (32%) spoke of the university as teaching, providing information, doing research, whereas only about one-sixth (16%) wanted the university to take direct action, that is, to organize social programs out in the community, to get students and faculty "out there" providing services, or to play a political advocate role. Again, these calls for action were heard most frequently from community health workers and from those in welfare and other social agencies. Another dimension was whether the university was described in a positive or negative light. Only a tiny minority (2%) said positive things about the university when it was mentioned at all, while close to a third (31%) had negative things to say. Negative statements accused the university (particularly the University of Pittsburgh, but sometimes universities generally) of being manipulative and secretive. Participants said that the university used people and was unwilling to share its resources and power, particularly with the less fortunate in the community. Accusations of this sort were very seldom found among the statements of those who responded to the goals survey where the universities in the area seemed

---

*Other data collected by University-Urban Interface Program show that trustees, administrators, faculty, students and alumni also share the view that the university's major functions are teaching and research. Social action is far down the list.

to have a generally positive valence. However, in face-to-face interaction, some underlying hostility came out. Again, this type of response came mainly from those participants who were working with disadvantaged groups.

In a third source of information, the project investigators in an independent analysis of the recorders reports and minutes from the feedback and plenary sessions also defined the areas of complaint from participants about the university and the solutions given for easing the tension between the university and the community. (Gow and Salmon-Cox, 1972) These are summarized in the chart below:*

Why Are There Tensions Between the University and the Community?	What Can Be Done To Alleviate These Tensions?
1) Presumptiousness of the University in deciding what is good for the community	1) Establish a more collaborative relationship
2) Using community as guinea pig for basic research (community takes pride in scholarly achievement but feels this should not be called "service"; selling a research project as a service but then just "using" the community)	2) Do real research on community problems and goals. At least do not call research "service" when the results do not even get back to the community.
3) Using the less articulate and less influential for consultation but not sharing power with them	3) University should make an extra effort to involve less-than-"establishment" people in real power-sharing decisions concerning their community; form jointly-governed organizations
4) Confusion created by fragmented and decentralized university	4) Organize a bridging device between the talent pool and community needs.
5) Misunderstanding on the part of the community as to university financial resources--community sees it as one funding pool, university sees most funds as already allocated for teaching and research	5) Have funds set aside for community participation that are <u>in addition</u> to instructional and research funds

*Extracted and reorganized for this report by Barbara Jameson of the

These findings seem to indicate that there is some confusion about what universities should be doing which tends to boil up in face-to-face interaction. Most people still say that a university should be mainly responsible for teaching and research, and they seem to have respect for the university's abilities to handle these functions. At the same time, some respondents in the survey and some participants in the Forums felt that the university could and should move into direct action on social problems. In the survey material, these seemed to be only suggestions, and there were fair indications of hostility toward the university for what it was not doing. In the Forums, however, those who were asking for action were also highly critical. The university was classified as one arm of an establishment (along with governmental, legal, and other social institutions) which was self-serving and uncaring about those who were "on the outside". The university, then, does not enjoy complete trust from all groups as an institution from which cooperative problem-solving can be launched. Particularly spokesmen from those groups who feel that they have been traditionally left out of policy-making are suspicious of any part of the system. It may take a good deal of exploratory work in building trust before they will feel that they are being given a real voice within any inter-organizational effort. At the same time, the university with its access to information and consequent respectability as a molder of public opinion was seen by many as the most desirable place to hold public forums which would bring diverse groups together to discuss mutual concerns.

Questionnaire Follow-Up for Goals Forums

A week after a feedback report (Gow and Salmon-Cox, 1972) on the Forums was disseminated to the participants, a follow-up questionnaire was sent out to all persons who had attended any of the four Forums (excluding the project investigators and the University-Urban Interface Program researchers). One-hundred ninety-eight (198) questionnaires were mailed out and 75 (38%) were returned completed. The questionnaire was a very brief two-page document with a third page attached for additional comments. The purpose of the questionnaire was to determine the amount of "spin-off" from these intensive, day-long, multi-group meetings at both the formal and informal level. Additionally, respondents were asked for their reactions to the Forums in terms of their utility both as they were conducted and for repetition in the future. The Forum participants had expressed some concern for anonymity, so the questionnaire contained no background or identifying questions other than one asking with Forum or Forums the respondent had attneded. There were six structured and six open-ended questions, including the request for additional comments on the last page. This report will be divided into three sections. The first section will present the frequency distributions for each of the six structured questions. The second section will cover some of the cross-tabulations between the six variables. The third section contains content analysis of open-end responses with appropriate examples from the data.

Frequency Distributions

Distributions for each of the structured questions are presented below, followed by a brief discussion of the results.

Table 1

1. Which Forum or Forums did you attend? (%)

Conflict Management	24	
Administration of Justice	27	
Health Services	30	
Metropolitan Government	19	N = 88*

*Some individuals attended more than one Forum, thus inflating this N.

Table 2

2. In terms of your own feelings about the Forum(s) you attended, would you say the experience was a useful one? (%)

Very useful	20	
Somewhat useful	63	
Not useful at all	17	N = 75

Table 3

3. Do you think it would be a good idea to have additional conferences of this kind? (%)

Yes	45	
Uncertain	36	
No	19	N = 75

Table 4

4. Although you may have known many of your fellow participants prior to the Forum, did you form any new contacts or closer contacts which have been useful for your efforts in urban problems? (Please check as many as apply.)*

No	53	
Yes, I met people to call about specific problems	44	
Yes, led to an additional meeting(s) or conference(s) on urban problems	07	
Yes, led to formation of committee or group to work on urban problems	01	
Yes, other	03	N = 75

*Percentages add up to more than 100 because some respondents checked more than one category.

Table 5

5. Did you report to anyone on the Forums or tell others about them? (Please check as many as apply.)*

No	28
Yes, I was requested to report to people in my office or agency	23
Yes, I was requested to give a report to some other group or agency outside my work place	01
Yes, I talked about it to others in an informal way, e.g., neighbors, friends, people at work	57

N = 75

*Percentages add up to more than 100 because some respondents checked more than one category.

Table 6

6. Did you personally find attendance at the Forums satisfying in any way? (Please check as many as apply.)*

No	12
Yes, I found some of the ideas interesting or useful	57
Yes, I heard some new points of view I had not considered before	41
Yes, I met some new people I enjoy seeing in a social way	18
Yes, I met some new people helpful to me in my work situation	33
Yes, other	10

N = 75

*Percentages add up to more than 100 because some respondents checked more than one category.

Discussion: The distribution of returns by Forum attended was fairly representative, at least in the sense that the Forum which had the largest number of participants, Health Services, also had the largest questionnaire return, and the Forum which had the smallest number of participants,

Metropolitan Government, also had the smallest questionnaire return. The great majority of the respondents found the Forums at least somewhat useful, and a slightly larger percentage said that they were very useful, as compared with those who thought they were not useful at all. Reaction on the whole, then, can only be characterized as qualifiedly positive. Still, close to half of the respondents felt it would be a good idea to have additional conferences of this type, and only about a fifth definitely opposed any repetition. Slightly over half of the respondents said that they had made neither new nor closer contacts through interaction in the Forums. This response suggests that, in spite of the attempt to diversify participants, people involved in urban concerns in a city the size of Pittsburgh are very likely to become acquainted with one another. Still, for over two-fifths of the participants who answered the questionnaire, the Forums were an opportunity for new or closer contacts with individuals who shared specific problem interests. At the same time, there was very little evidence of formal spin-off in the sense of Forum interaction leading to additional meetings, conferences, or committees. Just over a quarter of the respondents apparently passed on no information about the Forums to others. Close to a quarter reported to people in their offices or agencies, but most of those who passed on information about the Forums did so informally to neighbors, friends, people at work, and so on. Finally, all but a small minority seemed to have found at least some personal satisfaction in attending the Forums through hearing interesting ideas, becoming acquainted with fresh points of view, meeting people helpful to their work situation, and meeting people they enjoyed in a social way, in that order.

In summary, although there was some uncertainty about the general utility of the Forums and little evidence of spin-off in the form of subsequent group activity because of the stimulus provided in the Forums, most of the respondents seemed to have found something positive and rewarding in the experience. Many found new avenues for consultation over urban problems, and most got some kind of personal satisfaction out of the experience. The open-end material will provide more insight into the meaning of these general findings.

Cross-Tabulations

In this section, a series of five cross-tabulations are presented from the six structured questions. In the first table, responses in terms of "usefulness" are classified by Forum attended. The N is reduced for this tabulation because individuals who attended more than one Forum have not been included, since the intention is to differentiate by exposure to a particular Forum. The responses on usefulness are then cross-classified with questions three through six. Since, as the distributions in the last section showed, some individuals checked more than one of the possible "yes" responses on questions four through six, the responses for these questions have been reduced to the percentage saying "no," and the percentage who checked one or more "yes" responses. Following the first table (Table 7) and again following the next series of four, a brief discussion will be included.

Table 7

Conflict Management (%)		Administration of Justice (%)	
Very useful	07	Very useful	22
Somewhat useful	43	Somewhat useful	56
Not useful at all	50	Not useful at all	22
	N = 14		N = 18

Health Services (%)		Metropolitan Government (%)	
Very useful	21	Very useful	25
Somewhat useful	71	Somewhat useful	75
Not useful at all	08	Not useful at all	00
	N = 24		N = 08

Discussion: The tables above show quite clearly that the first Forum, the one on Conflict Management, received the most negative evaluations. While there may have been other factors involved, this was the only Forum not organized around a clearly visible and pressing urban problem. Some of the comments made on why the experience was not useful indicate that participants found the discussion lacking in focus and too abstract to be meaningful:

> Maybe it is a matter of different definitions, but my workshop experience was primarily a place of airing opinions. There was little available focus on where it would go from there.
>
> The issues raised were not among the important ones. The conflict management issue is quite irrelevant the way it was presented. It mobilized the discussion for nothing.
>
> These are the people who indirectly cause or profit directly or indirectly by conflicts. I cannot see how a problem can be solved without attacking the cause. This was not done in this forum.

Table 8

Good Idea for Additional Forums (%)	Experience Useful (%) Very Useful	Somewhat Useful	Not Useful at All
Yes	87	45	00
Uncertain	13	45	31
No	00	10	69
	N = 15	N = 47	N = 13

Table 9

Experience Useful (%)

New or Closer Contacts (%)	Very Useful	Somewhat Useful	Not Useful at All
No	07	57	92
Yes	93	43	08
	N = 15	N = 47	N = 13
			T = 75

Table 10

Experience Useful (%)

Report to Anyone (%)	Very Useful	Somewhat Useful	Not Useful at All
No	07	57	92
Yes	93	43	08
	N = 15	N = 47	N = 13
			T = 75

Table 11

Experience Useful (%)

Attendance Satisfying (%)	Very Useful	Somewhat Useful	Not Useful at All
No	00	04	54
Yes	100	96	46
	N = 15	N = 47	N = 13
			T = 75

Discussion: Not unexpectedly, these four cross-tabulations indicate a very consistent trend. When people thought that the Forums were a very useful experience, they were also highly likely to say that it would be a good idea to have more conferences of this type, that they had made new or closer contacts helpful for them in their work on urban problems, that they had reported to others on the Forums, and that attendance had been personally satisfying to them in one or more ways.* When people thought the Forums were not useful at all, the trend was just the opposite on every question. People who thought the Forums were a somewhat useful experience tended to fall somewhere in the middle of the two extremes. The tendencies are not entirely clear cut, however. For example, some who thought the Forums very useful and a sizeable minority of those who thought they were not useful at all said they were uncertain as to whether it would be a good idea to have additional conferences of this type. The reasons for these seemingly contradictory stances in some responses will be explored in the open-end material analysis.

Content Analysis

There were five open-end questions and one request for additional comments on the last page. The material from each was reviewed and classified as to major content. This classification will be presented below separately for each question with appropriate examples of the kinds of statements included.

---

*On the question about attendance being personally satisfying, particularly, respondents were likely to check multiple responses. It is interesting to note that those who found the Forums very useful (N = 15) checked a total of 40 positive responses or about 2 2/3 for each person, those who found the Forums somewhat useful (N = 47) checked a total of 71 positive responses or about 1 1/2 for each person, and those who found the Forums not useful at all checked nine positive responses or less than one per person.

Question 2a. was a follow-up to the question as to whether respondents found the Forum experience a useful one. It read: "Why would you say that?" Sixty-six of the respondents wrote in answers. Of those which were essentially positive in nature (33), over two-thirds spoke in terms of finding the discussion in the Forums stimulating and/or appreciating the exposure to different viewpoints represented in the Forums:

> The Forum provided an additional opportunity for interchange of ideas and viewpoints between persons of differing occupational and attitudinal backgrounds.
>
> There was a good exchange of information and a look into other parts of the system and other viewpoints.
>
> I believe persons holding not only divergent viewpoints on controversial subjects but even positions of extreme opposition to other participants came away from these conferences with a fuller realization that civil exchanges can ameliorate and, to a degree, even harmonize ideological or philosophical differences. That maybe--there are actually THREE ways to solve problems, MY WAY, YOUR WAY, AND THE RIGHT WAY.

The remainder spoke of the Forums having brought the relevant people together:

> It gave me an opportunity to both express my views and listen to the view of other persons who were aware of the problems concommitant with the Administration of Justice.
>
> Getting community people and University people somewhat intensively involved around the real concerns of the area.

Even among these essentially positive responses, doubt was sometimes apparent about the long-term worth of the Forums:

> The Forum laid the ground work for further study and dialogue. I became familiar with the points of view of other segments of the population. But in itself, the Forum solved nothing.
>
> Interesting day, fun discussion, better appreciation of some of the issues involved. But no significant impact.

This concern with eventual worth or impact, was much more explicitly raised among those who were clearly doubtful about the utility of the Forums:

> While the session was interesting, without further discussion it was of little continuing value.
>
> It was more identifying of the same problems and issues which have been identified a hundred times before. If the purpose of the Forum was education, it served a somewhat useful purpose. If the purpose is ACTION on problems, I found the Forum of not much use.
>
> A "one-shot" deal is frequently not too productive in long-range planning and continuation.

A second problem which was raised had to do with the organization and focus of the Forums:

> Maybe it is a matter of different definitions, but my workshop experience was primarily a place of airing opinions. There was little available focus on where it would go from there.
>
> People were talking--good! But obviously avoiding the main issues! Need more dynamic group leaders.
>
> Too structured.

Most of those who were flatly negative about the Forums stressed the staleness of the same people rehashing the same problems:

> Nothing new--not even the people.
>
> Just more talk by the same people who attend all such meetings.
>
> I do not feel that I learned anything new, nor do I think it made any real difference to the "urbans."

The few remaining negative comments centered on the choice of participants or the frustration of never getting anywhere on the solution of urban problems:

> Could be more successful if more "decision-making" people were involved.
>
> After you are involved for many years, you feel helpless and hopeless because nothing is ever resolved.

Discussion: In response, then to why they would say that the Forums were very useful, somewhat useful, or not useful at all, sixty-six respondents wrote in answers. About half of these could be classified as positive or qualified positive. Many people found the discussion interesting and helpful and were glad to meet new people with viewpoints that were fresh to the respondents. The problems that were raised were in terms of the temporary or "one-shot" nature of the enterprise, and the lack of focus in the Forums or flaws in organization. A minority were of the opinion that the Forums were useless because nothing new or interesting occurred according to their experience.

Question 3a. was a follow-up to the question as to whether respondents thought it would be a good idea to have additional conferences of this kind. It read: "Why would you say that?" Sixty-six persons wrote in comments for this question, and close to one-third of them were preoccupied with an issue raised in the previous question, that is, with a need for continuity or proceeding to the next step in the process of interaction:

> As I stated above, follow-up is necessary to achieve objectives of Forums.
>
> To keep the process going so that expectations, etc. could be defined and acknowledged upon.
>
> Because there needs to be a much more positive action--perhaps should be in conjunction with the County Commissioners.

> It is very important that individuals in various academic institutions and in various relevant occupations interact quite frequently to exchange ideas and information concerning potential solutions to the problems they face.
>
> Big problem is failure to follow up on such meetings.

Others who were generally in support of having more Forums felt that they were educational and helpful and/or provided a needed opportunity for inter-group communication:

> It has been my experience that any problem-solving affirmative action has to be preceded by meaningful dialogue surrounding the options. The Forum provided a stimulating setting for that dialogue to take place.
>
> It always helps to communicate, and to educate, and hopefully to motivate.
>
> Good for diverse and even hostile "real world" actors to exchange ideas in neutral atmosphere.

Five of the respondents thought that this was a good mode of providing feedback and exchange among those working separately in different fields:

> Periodic "stock-taking" among those involved on a day-to-day basis in their <u>own</u> activities is more profitable when others <u>in</u> allied fields participate as well, i.e., police with judges, correctional people with prosecutors, etc.
>
> The health field is very complex and at least three major groups, RMP, CHP, and Health and Welfare Association working full-time on problems. Activities such as the conference should be worked through them and include others to provide more information.

Some of those who wanted more conferences expressed also a desire for some change in orientation or focus. Others who were more openly dubious said that any further efforts would have to be better planned or differently organized:

> Only with proper pre-planning where all participants had a working knowledge as to the goals and objectives of the meeting.
>
> The aura of mutual suspicion at this time in our history seems to indicate to me that much smaller inter-personal enterprises would be more advantageous. But this presupposes knowledge of what such encounters are supposed to be about--INITIALLY.
>
> Airing of views is useful, but good, oriented workshops accomplish more.
>
> I believe Interface needs to decide whether conferences are (1) to discuss the subject generally, or (2) to discuss what the University should do about the subject. Aiming at both targets as at present risks missing both.
>
> Much depends on organization and participants. Often these things decline into perennial gatherings of "professional" meeting goers and accomplish little besides some group therapy.

Thirteen comments were entirely negative. Most of these centered either on a sense of waste of time and money or suspicion of the motives of the University:

> Waste of time.
>
> It is a waste of federal money. The program was <u>obviously</u> structured to gather money for the program involved.
>
> Because I cannot feel that any of the many problems that exist were solved or innovative solutions arrived at.
>
> It is time to get serious. Another conference of the same kind would be a clear message that the University wants no involvement. It would be much more honest and efficient to simply say so.
>
> Of this kind? NO! Conferences where the community would tell to Pitt what they think about the University and its role? YES!

The few remaining negative responses were calls for action rather than words:

> I really think additional conferences would only serve to deepen frustration. If one were to be held, it should be directed at action not mere recommendations without follow-up.

Discussion: While many of the respondents seemed to be in favor of more conferences, if only for the stimulation they provided, a slight majority were either doubtful about the worth of additional efforts or clearly opposed to repetition. Those who expressed doubts wanted changes in focus, planning, objectives and/or organization. Clearly negative respondents expressed feelings of wastefulness and mistrust of underlying motives.

Question 3b. as an additional follow-up to the question about whether it would be a good idea to have more conferences, the participants were asked: "In terms of solving major urban problems in the Pittsburgh area, can you suggest any other ways of getting people from different segments of the community together to work on them?" Fifty-seven respondents wrote in answers to this question, eight of them saying that they could not think of any other ways. About half of the remaining responses actually did not suggest alternative modes for interaction, but rather made suggestions about better planning and direction for additional conferences, the need for continuity or follow-up, or the necessity for different group inclusion:

> (1) Define the significant issue, (2) identify affected population group, (3) identify power element able to affect issue, (4) identify areas where power group might be pressured to alter position, and (5) mobilize and take nonviolent though viable action.

> Actually the symposium method can be used, but the University is guilty, I think, of feeling that they are able to provide all of the expertise and that they are privy to all of the answers to the problem.
>
> No, however, I do not think one meeting is enough. If the problem is important enough to have one meeting then there should be more to arrive at some conclusion.
>
> The idea of the University as convenor is good, but if the goal is action rather than information and discussion, some thought must be given to the follow-through.
>
> By broadening the base for recruiting interested persons. Problem seems to be that only those who are seen as leaders are the base, where this is often not the case.

The rest of those who wrote in answers for this question had a variety of suggestions for alternative modes to the Forums:

> A periodic setting forth of views from, e.g., those who participated in Forums, could be published quarterly or semi-annually to provoke further interchange of ideas. Should be directed to Greater Pittsburgh Community only.
>
> I doubt if the problem will be solved by exploring a topic as broad as justice administration. Why not take a specific subject within an area (the county jail; increasing police protection; court sentencing) and have the key persons involved (especially the elected policy officials concerned) respond to specific policy alternatives which can result in a new policy to be presented for legislative action.
>
> Perhaps it would be appropriate to take "problem-identifying" oriented workshops into the various communities in greater metropolitan Pittsburgh. The logistics of this task would no doubt be extremely difficult.
>
> Yes, joint planning, with shared authority, on real and immediate issues.

> The major proposal that I would make is that conferences of the type which have already been held be convened not only to exchange ideas but also to observe the actual processes which are under discussion and then spend time in evaluating those processes and making suggestions for their improvement. For example, a conference on Administration of Justice might spend time observing City Court in operation or observing the manner of treatment of prisoners in the Allegheny County jail and then meet to discuss what they say and make suggestions for change.

Discussion: Most of the respondents who answered this question wanted at least some changes if additional attempts at interaction were made. Less than half, however, really suggested alternative modes, although those who did produced a wide variety of suggestions.

Question 3c. Participants were also asked in connection with Question 3 which problems they would see as the most urgent to work on. Sixty-four respondents answered this question, and many of them cited two or more areas which they considered most urgent. There was little consensus over priorities. For specific mentions, housing and health care were most frequently included (13 each), followed by unemployment and/or job training (12). Problems of participation and allocation of authority in government were brought up fairly frequently also (10). Education and race-related issues received equal mention (7 each). Other problems cited were University-community relations (6), transportation (5), administrations of justice (4), youth programs (3), as well as welfare, public safety, outmigration, drug abuse, day care and traffic control (1 or 2 mentions each). The largest number of problems (16) which could be included in one category were of a more general rather than specific nature and had to do with lack of communication and/or lack of cooperation:

> Communications and working together cooperatively.
>
> Understanding of others' problems.
>
> That folks do not get together to talk, negotiate, etc.
>
> Striving for a more unified, cooperative effort on the part of private and public agencies to solve the problems (housing, vocational training, health services, mass transit, etc.) of Pittsburgh. The resources and talent are here.

Discussion: Most people were able to point to urgent urban problems which were in their own perceptions the most pressing. However, in no case, was any one problem cited by more than about a quarter of those who answered this question. Furthermore, although they had just attended four urban problem-oriented Forums, only health and government were cited by more than a tiny minority. The responses to this question show the possible problems in getting together on priorities, especially as most of these participants were chosen to attend on the basis of their interest in one of the focal areas of the Forums.

Question 4a. This question was asked as a follow-up to the structured question inquiring about whether participants met people to call in connection with work on urban problems, or whether they had participated in any further meetings, conferences, or committees which evolved as a consequence of the Forums. As noted before, few respondents reported any spin-off except in connection with meeting new people to contact about work. There were only six write-in responses to the open-end question which inquired about subsequent group activities and these were not very informative as to duration and content of such activities. Two respondents

mentioned establishing liaison with a new consultant, one spoke of two follow-up meetings without specifying content, and three participants reported that the Forums provided feed-in for projects in which they were already involved.

Additional Comments: Respondents were asked to write on the last page of the questionnaire any additional comments which they might wish to make on the Forums. Twenty-five participants wrote in additional comments. Five of these participants praised the University and its efforts, while five others felt that the University was either doing a public relations-type effort which was unproductive and misleading or had gone about the whole thing in the wrong way. Most of the rest of the commentary was directed toward the need for further sessions, often combined with suggestions that the next efforts should be differently organized or focused.

Discussion: In effect, the additional comments serve to re-enforce the kinds of responses garnered heretofore or to amplify on suggestions made earlier on the questionnaire.

Summary of Findings on Follow-Up Questionnaire

Reactions to the Forums were mixed, although, on the whole, toward the positive side. It seemed that the first Forum, which had the least specific focus, also received the most criticism. Quite a few participants felt that the intellectual discourse and diverse group interaction provided a valuable end in itself. Others, however, clearly thought that the Forum meeting was only a beginning and would only be of any lasting value if continued interaction in some form took place. At least a minority of these people felt that the next step should be much more concrete and lead

to some specific action. Others wanted the organization and foci altered as a precondition for any additional efforts and were doubtful of the value of additional meetings under the Forum format. The general climate of opinion was that joint communication over problems was a worthwhile enterprise, but there was disagreement over purpose and organization. Not everyone felt that the content of the Forum they had attended was highly pertinent. This is not too surprising when one remembers the variety of priorities cited in response to the question about what are the most pressing problems to be solved.

A minority found the Forums a waste of time, either because they mistrusted the motives behind them or because they were weary of talk and frustrated by inaction. Much of the mistrust expressed on the questionnaires was directed specifically at the University of Pittsburgh and/or the Interface Program. This was not surprising given the origins of the Forums, yet again it does demonstrate that an initiating institution for a project of this kind must be prepared to accept criticism and mistrust.

The variation in response to the Forums is indicative of the diverse expectations and desires of the participants. Many seemed quite satisfied with a day of serious discussion in which many viewpoints were aired. Others were deeply disappointed that the Forums were "one-shot" affairs, which they thought constituted only a beginning in a long process. A minority were thoroughly frustrated because there were no concrete programs evolved in response to recommendations made in the Forums. People did not agree on how such meetings should be conducted or who should be there or, indeed, on what should be discussed. This divergence highlights the difficulties facing any such project. It is interesting that, in spite of the mistrust expressed for the university, no respondent suggested that

some other institution or institutions should have conducted the Forums or should take over the enterprise should it continue. As has been shown from the observers' reports on the participants at the Forums, respondents to the questionnaire also had many criticisms to express, yet appeared to expect the university to carry on if, indeed, they thought more should be done.

Conclusions

> In conclusion, therefore, this analysis of the Forums suggests that, at least for this particular community, the most promising next step would be to organize not more Forums of this sort but rather more of a working body, smaller in numbers of participants but broadly representative of the community and of the universities and colleges of the community, and put this body to work on (1) developing mutual understanding of how university-community collaborative efforts are to be supported financially and (2) designing a truly joint organization between the universities and the community in accordance with the guidelines suggested above. While the difficulties are many, the general spirit of the Forums suggests that there is reason to expect that this approach could be effective. (Gow and Salmon-Cox, 1972:74)

This is how the project investigators sum up the situation in the last paragraph of the feedback report which was sent to all Forums participants. It suggests some alterations in thinking about how to undertake cooperative action on urban problems through the experience of the Forums. As outlined in the beginning of this report, the Goals Project was originally planned with two basic objectives. The first was to set up an assembly which would be convened every two or three years and which would include all segments of the community. In the assembly, information on urban problems would be presented and feedback given by

participants. The second objective was to establish a policy research center. This center would be a permanent organization, staffed by experts from both the universities and the community. Its purpose would be both to provide basic information to the assemblies and to translate the proceedings of the assemblies into policy recommendations.

However, early in the planning stage, the Steering Committee for the project decided that the plan for one large assembly had a basic flaw. The project director and others involved in the University-Urban Interface Program proposal had felt that it was essential to involve in any joint community planning those elements of the community which had not ordinarily been consulted, specifically representatives of minorities and other disadvantaged groups. The Steering Committee reasoned that, if such groups were to be represented, they would really have to have an opportunity to make inputs into the flow of information rather than serve primarily as an audience. Thus, the plan for one large assembly rather formally organized was altered to become a series of smaller Forums with an emphasis on informal, face-to-face discussion groups.

This internal decision to change the assembly format was the first of a series of experiences which led to the reasoning in the paragraph quoted above. The data presented in the several sections of this report shed some further light on why the project investigators in the end seemed to feel that the original objectives may have been somewhat premature. On the one hand, the project seems to have been an undisputed success in several respects. It has been shown that considerable voluntary support and advice was mobilized both inside and outside of the university. Lists of appropriate participants were drawn up and invitations issued. Background papers were written and a community survey was conducted to provide infor-

mation and topics for discussion. People came to the Forums from diverse groups, engaged in serious discussion, and came up with recommendations. Furthermore, although opinion exchanges were lively and sometimes heated, participants from widely different backgrounds and interests succeeded in listening to one another without rebellion or withdrawal. On the other hand, in a number of ways, there were undercurrents of uneasiness, distrust, and frustration, and the Forums effort ended in an atmosphere of incompleteness. No concrete next steps were planned, nor was there an agreement among participants about what, if anything, had been accomplished.

The data from this report show that participants who represented minorities indeed did wish to be part of the discussion. It was from these representatives especially that complaints were raised about a university planning any community-oriented enterprise without involving the community from the start. Over the course of the several Forums, a seeming contradiction arose which was never resolved. In every Forum, and particularly in the one on health, community participants insisted that the University should do nothing without the help and advice of the community. Yet, at the same time, it was also always expected that the University would provide all the resources and take the next steps. The apparent logic behind this contradiction is that disadvantaged groups in the community are, virtually by definition, without sufficient monetary and other resources. If joint community-university efforts are to be made, then someone else will have to support them. The university is seen as part of the advantaged establishment, it was playing host, and therefore was expected to follow-up on the recommendations made in the Forums.

Those who were involved in the Goals Project had not seen the matter in this light. The monetary support provided by the University-Urban

Interface Program was strictly limited in time and amount. No further aid could be expected from the Office of Education which had funded for research and not for establishing a center or any other sort of organization. The University of Pittsburgh also had not committed itself to any long-term support of the project, and indeed had never agreed that it by itself could be expected to support the project to any degree for any length of time. The director of the Goals Project had therefore hoped that support for further efforts would emerge as a result of the Forums and would be forthcoming from other parts of the community. As it happened, however, those who were most interested in following through on recommendations made in the Forums were also likely to be those who were not in a position to provide additional funds. Representatives of more established elements in the community were more likely to take the Forums as "just another conference". They were more accustomed to meetings, committees, discussions, seminars, and so on which led to "nothing but talk". They were often able to gain satisfaction merely from the exchange of ideas without any great expectations for concrete results. Thus representatives of groups who might be in a better position to provide funds made no suggestions in that direction. Of course, it must be said that no proposal was introduced for a concrete step, such as a policy research center. In view of the complaints about University planning without community input this may have been a good tactic, yet without such a proposal, there was nothing for participants to rally around (or against perhaps).

In the light of these developments, the project investigators came to the conclusion that joint community-university action or planning would have to be organized in a different way. This was not to say that time spent in the Forums had been wasted; on the contrary, it was through the

Forum experience that new ideas had emerged. If a long-term approach to cooperative solutions for long-range community goals was to be developed, the initial effort would have to be collaborative and monetarily realistic. A working body of representatives of all segments of the community and of the local academic institutions would have to get together from the beginning to design a truly joint organization and also to mobilize adequate financial support.

The experiences of the Forums may be drawn on somewhat further in terms of the feasibility of cooperative efforts for urban problem solution and also to make somewhat more explicit the problems that this particular university encountered as host to this project. In the data from the Forums there was considerable evidence of an atmosphere of mistrust among groups in the community. Many social institutions came in for sharp criticism and suspicion, but the most concrete polarization occurred on the basis of race and class. At the same time, however, people do seem to be eager to get involved in working on social problems. Concern can be mobilized and representatives of diverse groups can work together, at least showing respect for one another's viewpoints even if they cannot reach a consensus on what should be done. Any such consensus could probably only occur as a result of long communication and negotiation. Nevertheless, that individuals are willing to try to understand one another and that, in fact, "learning about other viewpoints" was considered one of the most valuable consequences of the Forums according to follow-up questionnaire respondents makes the situation look hopeful. At the same time, it must be remembered that those who were most likely to attend the Forums were those who seemed to have some "extra stake" in the process, and it might be far harder to mobilize participation in the more general

issue of "how do we get together to solve urban problems?" If it can be mobilized, however, the question of who should be represented and in what manner will become extremely controversial. For the City of Pittsburgh community, at least, through the Forum efforts and the Goals Survey a long stride has been made toward identifying various segments of the community. But the variety of groups and organizations is staggering, and it cannot be taken for granted that any particular social unit is in harmony over goals within itself. The Forums experience also highlighted another problem. Not all community groups who feel they should have a full voice in urban planning will be able to make equal contributions in terms of money and other resources. Some may be able to contribute no more than their knowledge and experience in certain problem areas. Groups representing minorities and the disadvantaged have learned that they can band together to disrupt the plans of more established entities. Yet, according to what was said in the Forums, they still do not feel that they receive more than a condescending ear in community planning. One reason for this may be precisely that they do not control major funds. Ways and means for by-passing this consideration and including such groups as full participants regardless of financial input would seem to be necessary if urban problems are to be worked on without conflict and disruption. In spite of these rather staggering problems, however, efforts such as those suggested in the concluding paragraph of the Gow and Salmon-Cox report do seem worth pursuing given the possible gains.

For the University of Pittsburgh or other universities, it does seem clear that efforts to work with the community have to be launched with a somewhat greater commitment if they are to accomplish anything. Expectations that other groups will take over in the wake of a university innovation

are not realistic, unless the university too is willing to give continued support. Outside groups do not understand the university structure nor the nature of its resources and their often pre-determined distribution. A sincere effort may well backfire in a distrustful atmosphere where commitment has to be demonstrated and where "words and ideas" are not considered sufficiently useful inputs. A university, too--and indeed probably any other social institution--will have to be aware of making itself a target when it moves into some sort of community enterprise and be ready to accept criticism. Given the crowded nature of the urban scene and also the need to diffuse responsibility, a university will probably be increasingly constrained to initiate only in full collaboration with other community groups and organizations. In any such undertaking as the solution of urban problems, the university may well have a great deal to contribute. It may even be the place where ideas for movement in the direction of cooperative action can best be generated. However, it has certain kinds of knowledge but not others, its resources for this kind of effort are severely limited, and any university will have to recognize its limitations. Without a great deal of help from other sources, an effort like the Goals Project is not likely to come to full fruition. That kind of help has to be mobilized very early in the game. There is, otherwise, the distinct possibility that universities may be damaged rather than advanced in community relations by short-term forays into the community.

From the preceding remarks, a few rather concise recommendations may be culled:

(1) Joint community interaction on urban problem-solving seems both feasible and desirable. (Of course, this may hold true only for cities which, like Pittsburgh, have had some experience with cooperative action);

(2) The particular position participants occupy in their various agencies or groups probably does not have great significance, but it must be determined that participants are regarded as legitimate representatives by those for whom they claim to stand;

(3) Efforts in this direction would more profitably begin with working groups representing all constituencies in the community planning together to establish initial priorities and procedures for further action. The university or universities involved could be highly useful in supplying all relevant information at its command for workshop use;

(4) The effort might originate by university suggestion but should be put into practice only with joint support and either joint funding or funding from some interested but more detached source (e.g., the state government or a private foundation).

The reasons for this last recommendation are several:

(a) The Health Forum clearly demonstrated that a university cannot be accepted as a neutral source or mediator in areas in which it itself is a major supplier of services.

(b) Even were a university to constrain itself to conducting community-university interaction on problem-solving to areas in which it is not or is at least only marginally involved (in the other Forums both criticism and recommendations were more generally applied to other institutions as well as the universities), it will be accused of trying of dominate, that is, of planning without consultation.

(c) Any "one-shot" attempt will be ill-received, and it will need joint commitment to have a sustained effort. If the university initiates alone, the Goals Project experience suggests that it will be expected to go on footing the bill and contributing new initiatives.

(d) Even though a university may be in a fairly good position to identify groups that should be included, it must also be aware of inequalities among groups in capacities to provide resources. Although representatives of the disadvantaged have by definition less resources to contribute to any effort, it would be a mistake to think that it will be possible either to leave them out or include them on an unequal basis. "Grassroots" community groups have been able to frustrate powerfully-backed efforts in recent years. Substantial moneys may be needed for a sustained effort, and although putting in money sometimes ensures commitment, under these circumstances it may be highly advisable to seek major help from a more "disinterested backer" so that all representatives may approach the conference table on an equal footing.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Coleman, Morton, et. al. Is Conflict Utilization Underestimated? University of Pittsburgh, 1971. Background paper for University-Urban Interface Program, University of Pittsburgh, October 21, 1971.

Dahl, Robert. Who Governs? New Haven: Yale University Press, 1961.

Esman, Milton J. "The Elements of Institution-Building," in Joseph W. Eaton (ed.), Institution-Building and Development: From Concept to Application. Sage Publications, 1972.

Garrison, William A. Power and Discontent. Homewood, Illinois: The Dorsey Press, 1968.

Gow, Steele and Leslie Salmon-Cox. A University and Its Community Confront Problems and Goals. University of Pittsburgh, June, 1972.

Gow, J. Steele. Goals and Government of the Metropolis. University of Pittsburgh, 1972. Background paper for University-Urban Interface Program, University of Pittsburgh, February 24, 1972.

Holden, Matthew, Jr. Law and Order in the Metropolitan Area: Issues and Options. University of Pittsburgh, 1971. Background paper for University-Urban Interface Program, University of Pittsburgh, November 18, 1971.

Holzner, Burkart. Proposal to Establish the Pittsburgh Human Services Research Center (unpublished manuscript). University of Pittsburgh, 1971.

Hunter, Floyd. Community Power Structure. Garden City, New York: Anchor, 1963.

Key, U. O., Jr. Politics, Parties, and Pressure Groups. New York: Crowell, 1958.

Lubove, Roy. Twentieth Century Pittsburgh: Government, Business, and Environmental Change. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1969.

Miller, Walter B., Rainer C. Baum and Rosetta McNeil. "Delinquency Prevention and Organizational Relations," in Stanton Wheeler (ed.), Controlling Delinquents. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1968.

Nehnevajsa, Jiri. "Methodological Issues in Institution-Building Research," in Joseph W. Eaton (ed.), Institution-Building and Development: From Concept to Application. Sage Publications, 1972.

Nehnevajsa, Jiri, in collaboration with Alan Coleman. Pittsburgh: Goals and Futures. University of Pittsburgh: University-Urban Interface Program, January, 1973.

Nehnevajsa, Jiri. "Institution Building: Elements of a Research Orientation," a Report of the 1967 Proceedings of the Comparative Education Society.

Office of the Secretary. University-Urban Interface Program. (Brochure) University of Pittsburgh, 1972.

Office of the Vice Chancellor for Program Development and Public Affairs. University-Urban Interface Program - Supplementary Information. University of Pittsburgh, 1970.

Office of the Vice Chancellor for Program Development and Public Affairs. Proposal for Continuation of a University-Urban Interface Program. University of Pittsburgh, December, 1969.

Parsons, Talcott and Neil J. Smelser. Economy and Society. New York: Free Press, 1956.

Treuting, Waldo, et. al. The University and The Community in the Domain of Health. University of Pittsburgh, 1971. Background paper for University-Urban Interface Program, University Forum, December 9, 1971.

Truman, David B. The Governmental Process. New York: Alfred Knopf, 1951.

University of Pittsburgh. The Response of an Urban University to Change, Volume I Overview: A Report to the Commission on Institutions of Higher Education of the Middle States Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, March, 1971.

Wilson, James Q., et. al. Preliminary Report of the Committee on the University and the City. Harvard University, 1968.

END

DEPT.OF HEALTH
EDUCATION AND
WELFARE
U.S. OFFICE OF
EDUCATION
ERIC
DATE FILMED

9 28 73